Bound
Periodical 191535

Kansas City
Public Library

This Volume is for

REFERENCE USE ONLY

7-15—5m—P

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

Feb. 1- on image

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

CARL BECKER
GEORGE L. BURR
EDWARD P. CHEYNEY
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON
JAMES H. ROBINSON
FREDERICK J. TURNER

MANAGING EDITOR
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOLUME XX
OCTOBER 1914 TO JULY 1915

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
1915

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

APR 25 1916
191535

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XX

NUMBER 1. OCTOBER, 1914

ARTICLES

K. ASAKAWA — The Origin of Feudal Land Tenure in Japan 1

C. H. HASKINS — The Government of Normandy under Henry II., I. 24

C. M. ANDREWS — Colonial Commerce 43

E. B. GREENE — The Anglican Outlook on the American Colonies in the Early Eighteenth Century 64

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON — The Creative Forces in Westward Expansion: Henderson and Boone 86

DOCUMENTS—Letters relating to the Negotiations at Ghent, 1812–1814 . 108

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 130

NOTES AND NEWS 215

NUMBER 2. JANUARY, 1915

ARTICLES

A. C. MCLAUGHLIN — American History and American Democracy 255

C. H. HASKINS — The Government of Normandy under Henry II., II. . . . 277

CONYERS READ — The Fame of Edward Stafford . 292

GAMALIEL BRADFORD — A Portrait of General George Gordon Meade 314

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

J. F. BALDWIN — Concilium and Consilium . . 330

EDWARD CHANNING — Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 . . 333

U. B. PHILLIPS — Slave Crime in Virginia . . . 336

DOCUMENTS—Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780–1782, I. . . 341

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 377

HISTORICAL NEWS 443

NUMBER 3. APRIL, 1915

ARTICLES

The Meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago 503

G. S. FORD — Boyen's Military Law 528

C. M. ANDREWS — Anglo-French Commercial Rivalry, 1700–1750: the Western Phase, I. 539

A. H. STONE — The Cotton Factorage System of the Southern States . . . 557

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

A. T. OLMSTEAD — The Reform of Josiah and its Secular Aspect 566

G. L. KITTREDGE — James I. and Witchcraft . . . 570

H. B. LEARNED — Casting Votes of the Vice-Presidents, 1789–1915 . . . 571

DOCUMENTS—Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780–1782, II. . . . 577

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 613

COMMUNICATION 680

HISTORICAL NEWS 682

NUMBER 4. JULY, 1915

ARTICLES

W. L. WESTERMANN — The Economic Basis of the Decline of Ancient Culture . . . 723

G. B. ADAMS — Magna Carta and the Responsible Ministry 744

C. M. ANDREWS — Anglo-French Commercial Rivalry, 1700–1750: the Western Phase, II. 761

W. S. ROBERTSON — The United States and Spain, 1822 781

F. A. GOLDER — The Russian Fleet and the Civil War 801

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

G. L. BURR — How the Middle Ages got their Name 813

DOCUMENTS—Observations of Superintendent John Stuart and Governor James Grant of East Florida on the Proposed Plan of 1764 for the Future Management of Indian Affairs, contributed by C. E. Carter; Letter of Kamehameha II. to Alexander I., 1820, contributed by F. A. Golder; Salt Lake City in 1847, contributed by Katharine B. Judson 815

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 836

COMMUNICATION 900

HISTORICAL NEWS 901

INDEX 934

Volume XX] *October, 1914* [*Number 1*

The

American Historical Review

THE ORIGIN OF THE FEUDAL LAND TENURE IN JAPAN

IT is quite beyond the range of possibility, in an attempt to prove a certain sequence of social conditions and results, to try on a nation a series of experiments on a large scale which would require for their maturity circumstances of great and changing complexity extending over centuries. It must then be a matter of uncommon interest to the student of the history of human society to observe that Western Europe and Japan,[1] with no mutual relation between them, independently evolved in the course of a long time those peculiarly definite and exhaustive social adjustments that are known as feudal, under conditions and upon principles which were, if significant in their minor differences, also striking in their extraordinary similarity in the main features. Human history, which so usually eludes a comparative study of its great divisions, becomes, under such circumstances, nearly comparable, and should therefore afford invaluable data to the scientific student of social evolution.

The interest of the theme is enhanced, in the case of Japan, by the fact that she possesses a body of original sources sufficiently large to invite a careful investigation, and larger than may be offered by some of the other non-European nations that are said also to have known feudalism in their history.

Following is a summary statement of some of the conclusions and problems[2] of a study of the origin of the Japanese feudal land tenure on its purely institutional side. For it is thought that an analytical view of the institutional aspects of a great social devel-

1 "Die beiden grossartigsten Beispiele des entfalteten Feudalstaates, Westeuropa und Japan." F. Oppenheimer, *Der Staat*, p. 108.

2 A full discussion of the subject and of the sources for its study will be presented later in a monograph, to which the present paper may serve tentatively as an introduction.

opment might well precede any economic or sociological interpretation of it.

I.

The political society of Japan before the seventh century was composed largely of patriarchal units (*uji*) and of groups of people (*be, tomo*) formed after the pattern of these units. Each unit had its chief, who exercised control over its members and the people of the groups attached to the unit, as well as over the land on which they subsisted. The emperor was in theory the head of the entire ruling tribe, but in reality his power rested chiefly on the members of his own unit and the people of the groups he had specially created, and on the land in possession of the unit and the groups (*mita, miyake*). He was hardly more than the largest among the patriarchs. One of the latter was rising in power so fast that it seemed almost to rival the imperial authority, while throughout the realm the inevitable tendency toward decentralization appeared increasingly alarming. It was the inherent dangers of this system, added to the threatened peril of an invasion from China, that necessitated the great Reform of the seventh century.[3]

The Reform was an adaptation of a system of state socialism that had been elaborated in China. It established a broad division of the free people into the governing and the supporting classes. The governing class consisted of a new civil nobility of rank[4] and office,[5] the higher ranks and offices being accompanied with definite grants of rice-land to be held during their tenure, and every holder of rank and many a civil servant being exempt from the payment of tributes and forced labor.[6] The supporting or taxable class constituted the bulk of the free citizens;[7] it was provided with

[3] Preliminary measures of reform may be traced back to earlier years, but a radical and thorough reorganization of the state-system was begun in 645. After much experimentation, the institutional foundation of the reformed state was nearly completed when the Code of 701 was promulgated.

[4] The system of ranks was instituted in 603, and was revised five times before 701. The final system of 701, which continued till 1869, contained nine chief ranks with thirty subdivisions.

[5] Early in the eighth century, there were provided, exclusive of military offices, civil posts for more than 8300 officials in the capital and more than 3500 in the provinces.

[6] The taxes were of three main classes: the rice tax (*so*), the tributes of local products (*chō*), and the forced labor or its equivalent payable in kind (*yō*). The new nobility was immune from the last two, which were by far the more onerous forms of taxation, but, theoretically, not from the rice tax. Some will probably maintain that at least the office-land (*shiki-den*) was exempt also from the rice-tax, but it may be demonstrated that such was not the intention of the law, excepting the office-land assigned to the provincial governor (*ku-ge-den*).

[7] The population of this period has been estimated as four or five millions, and at the beginning of the feudal régime in 1186 as seven millions or more.

equal allotments of rice-land subject to a periodical redistribution. The citizen owed to the state taxes and military duties.

This is a schematic view of the social reorganization that was really devised and put into operation. On closer examination, the system will be found to have contained elements which would be certain in the course of time to defeat its own ends. Nor did the system comprehend all the land and all the people that existed.

First, as regards the people. The new nobility was indeed conceived on a new basis, but its personnel was essentially the same as that of the old patriarchal nobility.[8] It may be presumed that the new nobility could not so readily have outlived the old habit of coveting private possession of land and men, and of regarding affairs of state much in the light of private concerns. The new taxable population was also in all probability composed mostly of the old free people of the pre-Reform period and their descendants.[9] It is true that the old units and groups as such were no longer recognized by law, and all the free men and women were placed under the direct control of the state; but this must have meant merely that the free were no longer permitted to possess and to exercise public rights over one another. Beyond this, the new system was not intended to do away with class distinctions among the free; nor did it abolish the unfree, who in fact are found after the Reform in considerable numbers and in conditions of great diversity among themselves. The unfree received small allotments of rice-land, but returned no tributes; the private menials were hardly under the direct rule of the state.

Next, as regards land. There is evidence to show that the law of equal allotment of land was in reality largely enforced, though at different times in different parts of the country. But the allotting need not be taken in every case in the sense of an actual carving out of rice-land, which from the very nature of the land of this description was impracticable.[10] The allotment was presumably,

[8] An imperial rescript of 646, addressing itself to members of the old nobility, said: "Now the manner of securing your service is to abolish the old offices, to establish new offices, and to mark grades of ranks, so as to appoint you with offices and ranks." *Nihongi,* XXV., in *Koku-shi tai-kei,* I. 443.

[9] More precisely, the taxable class consisted of most of the old clan (*uji*) members, some old group (*tomo*) people, and those of the old nobility whom fortune had reduced to the common rank.

[10] For three important reasons, among others. First, rice-land (*ta*) was terraced in different levels for the purpose of irrigation, and could not always be easily parcelled. Secondly, much labor had to be invested in this class of land, in its first cultivation, its continual irrigation, and in the careful culture and harvesting of rice. Thirdly, the rigid delimitation of rice-fields, in addition to the heavy expenditure of labor required in their use, forced their cultivation to be

in many instances, a flexible adjustment of tracts in the official register.[11] Much the same thing may be said of the periodical redistribution.[12] It was also fatal to the system that the authorities permitted the holder of the allotment to transfer its title by sale or mortgage. Before the eighth century was over, the allotment-land was neither equal nor re-allotted; it had become an unequal, private possession of people. Even allotting among the new population was all but discontinued by the end of the ninth century.

A question of the utmost importance is, what was the allotment-land (*ku-bun den*)? It was rice-land, and did not include the other kinds of tilled land[13] nor the vast tracts of arable and non-arable[14] land that then existed. Moreover, the allotment-land probably was the rice-land that was, at the time of the Reform, not only in cultivation, but also properly registered; there must have existed much rice-land which was cultivated but which escaped registration. It was evident that a system of state organization built upon an equal division of so limited areas of land would soon be upset by developments that must inevitably occur in the remainder of the territory.[15] If to this consideration are added other sources of evils latent in the large fiscal immunity of the noble and the unfree, as well as in the insatiable aggrandizement of the Buddhist Church, it is not strange that the life of the reformed state should

intensive. These conditions must have tended early in history to make the rice-land an object of exclusive private possession (whether of the individual or of the family) resisting arbitrary division and redistribution.

[11] "Rice-land for each member is not considered in detail; a grant is made [in totality] to the house-head in accordance with the number of persons in his house." *Ryō no shū-ge,* commentary on the Code of 701 compiled in the latter half of the ninth century (1912–1913), I. 392–394.

[12] *Cf. Ryō no gi-ge,* official commentary on the Code compiled in 833 (1900), p. 102. Only once, in 729, it was decided that an actual complete redistribution be made (*Shoku Ni-hon gi,* X., in *Kohu-shi tai-kei,* II. 170), but it is unknown whether this was accomplished.

[13] The homestead (*taku-chi*), including the adjoining vegetable-land, was, as might be expected, in permanent private possession and alienable, and was also untaxable, as was the land for mulberry and lacquer trees (*en-chi*). Some dry grain-land (*hatake*) was rented to people, and its extension was apparently unrestricted.

[14] Meadows and woodlands were, in law, not for private appropriation.

[15] Arable land was still extensive, especially in north Japan and in Kyūshū, and its opening either as wet rice-land (*kona-da*) or dry grain-land (*hatake*) was inevitable; the new fields thus created would, even if nothing else happened, more and more eclipse the relative importance of the allotment-land in the economic life of the people. Moreover, the prevailing system of agriculture in Japan at this time was evidently that of scattered farms (*Einzelhof*) based upon individual ownership, not in an over-developed form of the system, but rather in its earlier stages. It was futile to try successfully to supersede the system with another of a foreign origin adopted for the convenience of the authorities.

have been so brief as it was.[16] Out of its failure was evolved a feudal system.

The gradual evolution of the feudal tenure which immediately followed the Reform may be analyzed in two sections: first, the origin and growth of private landed estates, called *shō*; secondly, the rise of the warrior classes, and their gradual control of the *shō*.

II.

The *shō* was largely an illegal growth. When it made its appearance in the eighth century, the *shō* was seen to possess these three characteristics: it contained, as its chief original element, a recently cultivated area of rice-field; was under private possession and private management;[17] and enjoyed or claimed a degree of fiscal immunity. This species of land was destined in three or four centuries to absorb the greater part of the taxable land and people of Japan, while making itself almost wholly immune, and to arrogate to itself some of the sovereign functions of the state. It was the *shō*, therefore, that overthrew the Japanese state-system reconstructed in the seventh century. What was the origin of the *shō*?

It is evident that the cultivation of new soil formed an essential factor in the derivation of the *shō*. Impelled by the need of satisfying the growing luxury of the court and its devotion to the material welfare of the Buddhist Church, and, above all, by the rapid increase of population in central Japan in relation to the production of agricultural wealth, the government, especially in the first half of the eighth century, took bold, if not always wise, measures to extend cultivation. These measures comprised both the tilling of new land as an official enterprise—that is, under the supervision and at the expense of the government—and the encouragement of private cultivation.

The undertaking by the government seemed naturally to have yielded the best results in sparsely populated north Japan[18] and

16 The review that has here been given of the Reform of 645–701, though necessarily very brief, contains much that will supplement as well as modify the ideas published in 1903 in my *Early Institutional Life of Japan*. The whole subject is full of debatable points.

17 The word *shō* (Chinese, *chuang*) meant a rural house, or house attached to a rural estate. Its derived meaning, the estate, rather than the house, later became the chief meaning of the term. It will be observed that in either sense private enjoyment of property is implied.

18 There is a highly interesting document of 722 recommending the cultivation of one million *chō* of land, or nearly two million acres. This is not a place to prove by other evidence that the scheme was intended chiefly for north Japan, and that it was really carried out in part.

Kyūshū,[19] where arable land was abundant and the settlement of people from other regions was needed and encouraged. The newly tilled land was added to other unallotted land as "public land" (*kō-den*) or "surplus land" (*zhō-den*), and held in reserve for future allotment and other public uses; it was usually rented to the people, in order to insure its maintenance and to derive a revenue from it.

Before the eighth century was half over, however, their religious zeal betrayed the authorities into a dangerous policy relative to this class of land. While, on the one hand, forbidding the private transfer of land to Buddhist temples, the government, on the other hand, gave them extensive pieces of land, both out of the reserved tilled areas and from still uncultivated tracts; soon the government even forgot its earlier intention, and encouraged donations of land to temples by private citizens. And the "temple-land" (*zhi-den*), officially recognized as such, was untaxable. Conditions were, therefore, ripe for its further expansion by purchase, mortgage, gift, or nominal conveyance. It is mostly in connection with Buddhist institutions that we see the mention of *shō* in the eighth century.

The next century witnessed, not only further large grants to Buddhist temples, but also the reservation and partial cultivation of extensive tracts set apart for free disposal by the emperor[20] (*choku-shi den,* imperial lands). It is probable that a large part of the areas officially cultivated in the preceding century as "surplus land" was henceforth incorporated in the "imperial land".[21] The creation of the latter was accompanied by grants of these tracts and other cultivated and uncultivated land by the emperor to members of his house and other high personages (*shi-den,* granted land). The "imperial land" was immune from taxes, as was also the "granted land", like the "temple-land". In a short time an abuse which might have been anticipated became so frequent as to call forth an edict, in 902, to prevent its repetition; namely, arbitrarily to claim immunity of privately cultivated pieces of land by insisting either that they were originally imperial or that they had been given by subjects to imperial persons. The prohibition was not efficient, and its meagre effects were more than neutralized from the latter part of the next century, when a peculiar bicameral government, which

[19] In 823 there were 10,000 *chō,* or about 20,000 acres, of "surplus land" in Kyūshū.

[20] Between 828 and 844 alone, more than 7200 *chō* seem to have been reserved as "imperial lands".

[21] The exact meaning, however, of the sweeping decree of 885 declaring all the wet and upland tilled and arable areas as "imperial lands" is not clear. *Rui-zhū koku-shi* (1816), chap. 159, leaf 20.

then began its régime, encouraged, with a view to adding to the imperial revenues, the commendation of private lands to the ex-emperors as "imperial land". By that time, many great private estates of land had already grown up from another source.

This other source was the land newly cultivated (*kon-den,* cultivated land) by private persons independently of the imperial house, as well as meadows and woodlands around the cultivated areas as nuclei. Japan being at this time in that economic stage in which money was poorly circulated and land was the chief form of wealth, the disposition of arable land liable to be turned to cultivation should have been a matter of the greatest moment for the government to consider. According to the scheme of the Reform, all uncultivated land was to be under the direct control of the state, and the benefit of its cultivation was, in principle, to accrue to the people at large. In practice, however, when the need of extending cultivation was felt, the authorities met the problem with a vague and vacillating policy. They were forced to discover after costly experiments that restrictions tended to discourage new cultivation, while its encouragement produced inequalities and hardships among the people. Finally, already before the middle of the eighth century, it was decreed that the cultivator should have the ownership of the land he opened to cultivation, while its area should be limited in accordance with his rank. The intent of the law was that its benefit should be enjoyed by the common people, rather than by local magnates, court nobles, and Buddhist institutions. But it is needless to say that this end could hardly be gained; that the law not only failed to check the wholesale appropriation of new land by powerful men that had begun as soon as the Reform government was established, but also assured the steady progress of occupation. The government never succeeded in finding an effective policy regarding this difficult but all-important question; all it could do after the ninth century was to promulgate impotent decrees condemning the aggrandizement of great holders of land.

It would seem essential, in the study of the origin of the *shō*, clearly to distinguish the two sources that have been discussed. Immune *shō* were originally granted by the emperor, and were therefore as such legitimate; while the *shō* of private origin were born largely in defiance of the law, and, even when some of them received a grudging sanction of the government as lawful possessions, were not in all cases immune. The "granted lands" were standing models of immune estates, but they were, though many and large, not indefinitely expansive. Privately "cultivated lands"

could, on the contrary, be multiplied more readily and were in fact transferred more freely. The former were a cause of the *shō* as tax-free lands, but the latter were, it may be held, direct origins of most of the *shō* whether immune or not. It is seen that, although the *shō* appears from the early eighth century, it was not for at least four centuries thereafter necessarily immune from all taxation.[22] In fact, the study of the process of how the private *shō*, originating as I think directly from the newly cultivated land, came gradually to be assimilated by the immune tenure of the "granted land" and finally to absorb the latter and nearly all the other species of land[23] in the ever expanding scope of the term, constitutes one of the most interesting problems of the period.

III.

During the ninth century, if many a *shō* was still partially taxable, the commendation of person or of land to the *shō* by a peasant was also still largely incipient in form and condemned as illegal. In the next century and a half, however, a great progress was noticeable, both in the commendation of land, and in the rise of immune *shō*; the simultaneous advance of these two was natural, for immunity and commendation would stimulate each other. We now turn, therefore, to some of the causes of the progress of the *shō*. I venture to suggest that this was due, in its institutional aspects, to the parallel extension that took place, of the grant of fiscal immunity, on the one hand, and, on the other, of the private transfer of real rights pertaining to land. Here, again, one was official and legitimate, and the other was private and beyond the cognizance of law. Although their progress was mutually dependent, it is possible to treat them separately up to a certain point.

First, as to the extension of the grant of fiscal immunity. From the tenth century one may observe an increasing prevalence, among

[22] It has been suggested that the immunity of the *shō* of private origin may have been claimed on the pretext that it was an extension of a "house-land" (*taku-chi*), "*shō*" originally signifying a rural house, or of the land immediately adjoining the house (*en-chi*, garden-land), as these classes of land were legally private and immune. This may suggest why the word *en* was often used separately or in conjunction with *shō*, in speaking of the *shō* as an estate, but it fails to explain its immunity, for the institution was not in its early centuries invariably immune.

[23] In a list of the *shō* in the province of Yamato belonging to a temple which probably dates from the early twelfth century, each *shō* is divided into "untaxable" and "public" tracts, and in the former are included original "rank-lands" and "office-lands". *Tō-dai zhi yō-roku*, VI. This is an instance among many that show that these species of land had become assimilated into *shō*, and also that *shō* often comprised taxable areas.

the holders of *shō*, of resort to a legal custom which had already begun but had not been firmly established;[24] namely, to invoke charters[25] from the central and provincial authorities which in explicit terms recognized the estates as *shō*, defined their boundaries and extents, and exempted them from various taxes.[26] An important consideration about the charters was that they usually stated that, as before, the estates should be immune from some or all taxes, and that provincial officials should not invade them. A still more important point is, however, that it was discovered at the examinations held after 1069, that many *shō*, as might have been expected, had no accompanying charters,[27] that is, were not legally tax-free. I think it may be shown, perhaps conclusively, that a charter was not first issued for a *shō* as such, but for an "imperial land" granted to a Buddhist temple or to a noble personage, which, because of the increasing laxity of the provincial administration after the ninth century, needed to be protected against the visitation of the local official.[28] From this modest beginning, as the number and prestige of the *shō* increased, many of them that were controlled by imperial or noble personages or by powerful temples, succeeded through influence or favoritism in likewise securing charters for the estates, and the practice tended to spread.

[24] There were, from the eighth century, charters for the tilling of new land and of the grants of land to temples (see, *e. g., Dai Ni-hon ko-mon zho,* V. 597, 639–645, 652–655, 767, VI. 597–598; *Zoku-zoku gun-zho rui-zhū,* XI. 121; *Kō-bō dai-shi zen-shū,* I. 769–770; etc.), but the oldest *immunity*-charter that I have seen is dated 845 (see *Ko-mon zho rui-san,* third ed., p. 87), and it is difficult to duplicate the example from the ninth century.

[25] The full regular charters of a *shō* consisted of orders from the Grand Secretariat, from the Department of the Affairs of the People, and from the provincial and district authorities. Later there were charters less formal but none the less potent emanating directly from the emperor or the "cloistered" ex-emperor. In all regular procedure, a provincial official visited the estate with an agent of the *shō*, and put in stakes at its corners to mark its authorized extent. After the granting of the charters, local officials were not at liberty to enter the *shō* without special imperial sanction and without being accompanied by a representative of the estate.

[26] An example of a comprehensive charter occurs in 1050, which declared certain holdings of a temple "untaxable lands, free from intrusion by provincial envoys, and exempt from extraordinary miscellaneous services". *Kō-ya san monzho,* VII. 261–266.

[27] A *shō* belonging to a Shinto temple was, in 938, declared to have originally been a waste land which "for fifty years had been established as a *shō* and suffered no intrusion and examination". Unchartered *shō* of this kind became numerous. Often a great noble would disregard the formalities of invoking charters, and summarily order the meek provincial authorities to assist in the founding of a new *shō*. Provincial charters alone were not infrequently considered sufficient.

[28] Study the case of 845 referred to in note 24 above.

What further confirmed the status of the *shō* was the attempt of the emperor Go-Sanjō after 1069 to abolish all the *shō* established since 1045, and even those prior to that date that had no confirming charters. Unchartered *shō* were thus largely eliminated, and henceforth the possession of charters was regarded as a necessary concomitant of the existence or establishment of a *shō*; or, in other words, the *shō* was henceforth necessarily tax-immune in whole or in part. As fate would have it, the bicameral régime under three successive ex-emperors, which began soon after this date, happened to cause the number of *shō* to be greatly increased all over the country, marking a sudden and long progress in the creation of immune tracts of land.[29] In the middle of the twelfth century, immunity and the *shō* were almost interchangeable terms, so that all immune lands were alike called *shō*, and all private estates tended to become *shō*. The "imperial" and "granted" lands, the immune character of which, as I suppose, had originally furnished the model for the immune *shō*,[30] had now been completely absorbed by the latter. Not only that, but also the essentially private terminology that had grown up regarding the *shō* had come to be applied also to public administrative units of territory, even in official documents.

Secondly, as regards the private transfer of real rights concerning the *shō*. Immunity was a public right; its extension could not have been so complete as it was, nor could it have become a factor to bring about a feudal tenure of land, if immunity had not progressed, as it did, side by side with the private conveyance of certain real rights relative to the *shō*. These rights, however varied and however freely transferable they became in later years, may be presumed to have originally been derived from the fact of the first cultivation of the land in question The elementary forms of the rights were those in relation (1) to the use of the land and (2) to the dues in kind and in labor payable ultimately by the actual tillers of the soil. These and other real rights of the *shō*, when they became greatly diversified in later years, were collectively

[29] In an official record dated 1221, it is seen, for instance, that of the 86 public districts and private estates in the province of Noto, only two *shō* were established before 1050; eight estates, including very extensive *shō*, were founded apparently in the first half of the twelfth century; and the remaining 76 units were either made *shō* or, though still nominally public, treated much as if they also were private possessions, between 1186 and 1221. *Noto no kuni den-sū chō*, in *Shi-seki shū-ran* (revised), XXVII. 71–76.

[30] As a matter of fact, there were several other terms than *shō* that were applied to more or less immune estates, but their precise legal meanings are not yet clear, and probably cannot be determined in all cases; for a certain indefiniteness would naturally surround institutions whose origins were private and in part illegal.

called *shiki*. The transfer of *shiki* of a *shō* from one man to another may first have implied a separation of the right of some use of the land from its ownership. This separation once made, there was nothing to prevent further division, in the hands of many persons, of the various *shiki*, as, for example, the rights of the exploitation and of the control over the various dues, of the same *shō*.

As has been pointed out by Professor Nakada,[31] a distinction should be made between two kinds of transference of *shiki* according to the relative position in society of the persons effecting the transfer. The surrender of a *shiki* by one person of a lower station to another of a higher was termed *ki-shin*, which may almost literally be translated as commendation; a *shiki* granted by a higher person to a lower, for the purpose either of the management or of the economic exploitation of the *shō*, was often known as *on-kyū*, meaning benevolent gift, for which we shall use the term benefice. It will at once be observed that there was a wide difference, in their institutional origin, between commendation and conferring of benefice.

1. The primary aims of commendation were to secure protection and insure immunity. Protection oftener than immunity seems to have been the chief object of a common form of commendation which appears to have gradually shaped itself in the tenth century. According to this, the owner nominally gave up his *shō* to a stronger personage, for one generation or more, in order, as said the accompanying document, "to borrow his might and influence" or "to put a stop to the outrages of the provincial officials", but in fact reserved for himself his *shiki* as steward or bailiff of the *shō*. In form, the commendor surrendered ownership and retained the right of use; in reality, he retained possession and delivered only a part of the dues from the land. On his part, the receiving person often bound himself by a written document to forfeit his nominal ownership of the commended land, should he presume to meddle with its management, which rested as before in the hands of the commendor.

As immunity became more prevalent and more widely coveted, it was a growing tendency among holders of *shō* to mount higher in the ascending steps of their commendations until they should reach an imperial personage, a great temple, or a noble person above the third rank. It was in this manner that *shiki* of a *shō* came to be diversified and to be distributed among several persons and institutions, always with a high immune personage at the apex (*hon-sho*

[31] Professor K. Nakada's able paper was published in various numbers of vol. XX. of the *Kokka gak'-kwai zasshi*. I acknowledge my indebtedness to him in so far as regards the larger legal aspects of commendation and the benefice.

or *hon-ke*), who was able to override the local governor.[32] As immunity was becoming sometimes judicial and administrative as well as financial, commendation of this kind seems to have tended to prevail everywhere, and in fact, after the eleventh century, helped immunity itself to extend with facility. At the end of the twelfth, there could have been few *shō* which had not found their nominal immune owners; in fact, it was the boast of Fujiwara nobles that they controlled numerous *shō* but managed none themselves.[33] It should be remembered that the original commendors had usually contrived to retain their management and possession.

In any instance, it will be noted that the Japanese commendation was essentially contractual in character, and created a freer status for the commendor than was usually the case with commendation in medieval Europe, with further characteristic differences. The commendor, as has been seen, transferred to the commendee certain specified rights, but retained for himself other real rights of the same land; these reserved rights he was free to dispose of as he pleased, by means of commendations to other persons; and the several commendees thus created were likewise able to divide and convey to others the rights they had received—the result of this flexible arrangement, even aside from the conditions due to other causes that encumbered the normal *shō*, being often a network of customary rights of bewildering complexity.[34]

2. The benefice,[35] pure and simple, of *shiki* of the *shō* may be said to have originated with the privileges its owner granted to the men

[32] In 1017 people of a *shō* in Kii under the powerful noble Michinaga complained to him about a certain action of a provincial magnate, whereupon he summoned the latter to Kyōto. *Mi-dō kwan-paku ki*, Yale MS., bk. 15. In 1070 priests of Tō-dai-zhi invaded a district in Iga with a band of lawless men, arbitrarily determined the boundaries of a *shō* which the temple claimed, and maltreated a provincial official, robbing him of his horse and clothes; the government at Kyōto was unable to punish the culprits. T. Yoshida, *Tō-jo Ni-hon shi*, VIII. 268.

[33] When, in 1185, Fujiwara Kanezane was offered by Yoritomo the stewardship of a *shō* belonging to an imperial consort, he expressed his chagrin in his diary thus: "It would be exceedingly ugly to make me Steward of Her Ladyship's *shō*; there never has been such a thing in the family." *Gyoku-yō*, chap. 42.

[34] It requires all the analytical power one can command to follow the maze of the astonishingly intricate tenures pertaining, for example, to the *shō* of Kamino and Makuni, through documents scattered over the eight volumes of *Kō-ya san mon-zho*. The same may be said of any of the larger *shō* belonging to Kō-ya-san, Tō-zhi, or Iwashimidzu. A full analysis of the tenures of Shimadzu *shō* in southern Kyūshū would fill a large volume.

[35] Professor Nakada's treatment of this precarious tenure is specially lucid (see *Kokka gak'-kwai zasshi*, XX. ix, 66–90), but nearly all the sources he cites are dated after the thirteenth century. The general features of the tenure are well shown, but there is much to be studied as to the exact nature and evolution

who were employed in the actual management and cultivation of the land. These employees appear ever since the early part of the eighth century under a great variety of names; their services were rewarded with the use of pieces of land in the *shō,* with certain portions of its dues, or in produce or money. Their appointment and support were, though accompanied by a written form, founded on no mutual agreement, and were regarded purely as an act of favor on the part of the master, granted, as was explicitly stated in the charter, for the employee's earnest "prayer". By the act of accepting the benefice, therefore, the grantee imposed upon himself one-sided, precarious obligations;[36] the relation established by the act was more real than personal, and at first one rather of fact than of right. When the use of land was allowed, it could in no wise be looked upon as rented; and the furthest extent that the grantor's favor could reach was for him to state that the tenure of the land would be contingent upon the performance of his duties. The Japanese *on-kyū* thus closely resembled the *precarium* of medieval Europe, revocable at will; even when the practice later tended toward a hereditary holding of the privileges, in Japan as in Europe, the original precarious nature of the grant was often maintained in form.

When one considers that commendation and beneficing were in simultaneous practice, he may well imagine real rights created by both exercised side by side within the same *shō.* Such was indeed true. This is not to say, however, that they readily merged into or materially influenced each other. As a matter of fact, till far along into the feudal period, the tenures in all their complexity of these two different origins persisted independently, though in close juxtaposition.[37] The resulting *shō* was not a manorial or-

of the more important classes of the *on-kyū.* For this study, the abundant materials in possession of those historic Buddhist temples in Japan which were great holders of land constitute indispensable though difficult sources of information.

[36] It is, for example, instructive to compare, through their oaths of allegiance dated between 1265 and 1315, the relatively freer tenure of the *Ban-gashira* and other officials with the more precarious condition of the *Sō-tsui-ho shi,* the *Ku-mon,* and their agents, in the *shō* of Kamino and Makuni. See *Kō-ya san mon-zho,* I. 503–518, VII. 187–197, 199–214, 216–223, 225–226. Both classes of officials lived upon the *shō,* and many of them were original possessors of parts of the land and had held their posts for generations, but the first class consisted of direct representatives of landholders, and the second, of beneficed agents.

[37] For instance, glance over the succinct comments attached to the numerous estates controlled by the regent Michi-iye, in his testament dated 1250, and note the diversity of conditions brought about through division and transfer by generations of holders of lands and real rights which had originally been created by cultivation, purchase, commendation, or beneficing. *Ko-mon-zho rui-san* (third ed.), pp. 285–316.

ganization comprising strips of arable land laid out and administered by the joint intervention of the lord and the half-free tenants, but a large unit[38] in a "scattered farm" system, which was an agglomeration of fields of utmost irregularity in form and size and of great diversity in origin and actual condition; the interference of the community for the division and management of all of its land had little opportunity to develop in an organization where comparatively free and unfree tenures persisted side by side.

Now the crucial question arises: How, then, did the feudal land-tenure originate? The fief, as we find it in the Japan of subsequent ages, aside from its military relation, was practically contractual, and was hereditary and capable of subinfeudation,[39] while the benefice was, even in its later state, essentially precarious, and non-divisible without special sanction, though often hereditary. Could the one flow out of the other in the process of normal evolution? When the armed man entered the estate, was the fief naturally born of the benefice? In Europe results of commendations may have been readily assimilated to the common precarious status and have lost traces of their separate origin; but in Japan the tenure of commendation was decidedly freer, being specific, divisible, and transferable, and was inclined to maintain intact its own genealogy of rights and obligations. If merging did not take place on any large scale, where could the fief have arisen? The study of the whole question is more complex than it appears, and its definite institutional features remain still practically unexplored. I shall essay to evolve a working hypothesis by examining briefly the process by which the private warrior made his appearance on the scene and the conditions under which he gained control over landed institutions.

IV.

The exact institutional aspects of the rise of the Japanese warrior are not so clear as is generally assumed among scholars in Japan; nor is it the purpose of this paper to discuss them in detail. It will suffice to indicate the probable relation of the subject to that of land tenure. The Japanese warrior was, like the *shō*,

[38] The extents of the five *shō* established in Noto between 1136 and 1146 ranged between 60 and 400 acres, and one was as large as 1000 acres. See reference in note 29 above. These were among the larger *shō*.

[39] In 1206 the Shōgun's government ruled that no landed possession granted by the late suzerain would be revoked, except in case of a grave offense. *Adzuma-kagami*, XVIII., in *Zoku koku-shi tai-kei*, IV. 673. In the official manual of the feudal government of 1232 (*Jō-ei shiki-moku*), the right of the military holder of land to divide it among his children and relatives is admitted (in c. XX., XXII., and XXVI.), and his right of sub-granting it is implied (in c. XIX.).

which he later controlled, largely private in origin; he had his illicit birth in the social unrest that had resulted from the unforeseen failure of the reformed state established in the seventh century to secure peace and order. No sooner had the Reform been instituted than the nobility and clergy began to extend their control over a rapidly enlarging portion of taxable land and taxable people at the cost of the state.[40] The latter's expenditures, on the other hand, greatly increased from the eighth century. The burden of taxation was felt with growing heaviness by those people who still remained under the state's control and whose number was rapidly falling off. Those who would desert their allotted lands, but were unable to attach themselves to nobles and temples, drifted away as outlaws. The growth of this floating population had become alarming already at the beginning of the eighth century, and the government's efforts to restore order were unavailing, even at the capital. The society was restless, police laws were defied, and official soldiers[41] proved utterly ineffective against the deepening disorder.

[40] In 1197, that is, soon after the beginning of the feudal rule of Japan, the proportions of land under official control in the provinces of Satsuma, Ōsumi, and Hyūga, were, respectively, as follows: 5 per cent., 8 per cent., and .3 per cent. See *Ken-kyū dzu-den chō*, in *Shi-seki shū-ran* (revised), XXVII. 46–70. The following provinces were more fortunate: Tajima, 4 per cent.; Bungo, 12.5 per cent.; Hitachi, 22.5 per cent. See T. Yoshida, *Dai Ni-hon chi-mei zhi-sho*, introduction, p. 77. In these cases, the remainder of the areas consisted of *shō* and other species of more or less immune land; nor was the "official" land entirely taxable.

Earlier instances follow: an official report from Etchū in 1050 says that, owing to the recent rise of *shō* in the province, "people for public labor are scarce, and taxable land is very little". *Kan-chū ki*, in *Etchū shi-ryō*, I. 211–212. In 1107 the province of Kii reported that, of its seven districts, "six have each eight-or nine-tenths become *shō*. . . . Especially in the two districts of Ito and Naka . . . one or two villages only are left." The seventh district is also honeycombed with *shō*. *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, IV. 244–245.

The taxable population given in the Chinese dynastic history of Sung from a Japanese source was, at the end of the tenth century, 883,329. The entire population of this general period has been estimated as not less than four or five millions. There is little doubt that the population was increasing, but the decrease of the taxable population recorded in the census was alarming. In 914 a councillor stated that, out of the Ki-nai, Kyūshū, and the two northern provinces, there were only 300,000 registered taxable people, of whom, owing to the amazing inaccuracy of the census, more than a half were non-existent. He cites the case of a town in Bitchū, which in 647 could furnish 20,000 able-bodied, adult men, but in a hundred years saw its taxable population reduced to 1900, in another century to 70, and in 911 had not a soul registered. Miyoshi Kiyoyasu's memorial, in *Hon-chō bun-sui* (1888), II. 11–12.

[41] Official soldiers levied from among the people by a system of conscription were abolished in 739 and 792, except in the two northernmost provinces and in the islands of Sato and Kyūshū; those in the last were reduced almost by one-half in 814. Minor varieties of official military forces proved as useless, and all gave way, so soon as the early ninth century, before the growing disorder and the private warriors.

As things grew worse, it became a universal custom for the more competent among the country folk to provide themselves with arms for protection, though the private use of weapons was unlawful. It should be remembered that among the free citizens in the country there were many of noble and even imperial descent,[42] who possessed large tracts of land[43] and numbers of dependent people,[44] and who had added to their prestige by serving at the capital as guardsmen or other temporary officials.[45] The government depended in a large measure for peace in the provinces on these very people.[46] Among these the less responsible men became themselves disturbers of peace, especially when they had commended their land and themselves to temples or court nobles, and were thus enabled to defy provincial officials with impunity. The latter, accordingly, when they were appointed to their posts, often proceeded thither, in defiance of law, with their male relatives capable of bearing arms.[47] These would permanently settle in the provinces; the governors themselves, who should be transferred elsewhere at the end of their terms, tended to hold their office by heredity. In these two classes of local magnates, old and new, who often quarrelled among themselves and against one another, may be seen origins of the warriors (*bu-shi*) so largely private and illegal in character. Another and perhaps more important source must be sought in those who had seen service in the frontier garrisons of Kyūshū and the northern provinces; especially in the latter, where the Ainos resisted Japanese encroachment with tenacity, colonization of outlaws from other parts of the country was encouraged on a large scale, and great expeditions against the turbulent tribes were repeatedly organized, during

[42] References to descendants of the pre-Reform nobility and of imperial personages are innumerable in the records. Governors of districts (*kōri*) mostly were local celebrities and held their posts by heredity.

[43] When in the early eighth century the cultivation of new land was encouraged with promises of grant of ranks, there came forth men who had opened surprisingly large tracts.

[44] With much local variation, the remains of the census of the eighth century reveal at times the existence of great numbers of the unfree in individual families.

[45] The number of those who had at one time or another filled metropolitan posts and who had returned to the provinces as privileged men was large. In the early tenth century, nearly 3000 such men yearly left the capital.

[46] The official soldiery being inefficient, the authorities were compelled, from the last part of the eighth century, to enlist the service of the more wealthy men in the provinces who were skilled in arms.

[47] The violation of law in this respect may be inferred as early as 719 (see *Rui-zhū san-dai kyaku,* in *Koku-shi tai-kei,* XII. 646 ff.). Explicit and repeated prohibitions of this offense during the two ensuing centuries were unavailing; then, as will be seen later, the practice furnished, from the tenth century, the very foundation of a feudal nobility.

the eighth and ninth centuries, with men from among the colonists and from the neighboring regions. These men and their descendants, as well as chiefs of the Ainos who had surrendered, became professional warriors, at first half official in nature but later purely private. Court nobles, who were engaged in keen rivalry among themselves for political power at the capital, sought to augment their revenue, as well as enhance their prestige, by controlling numerous *shō* in the country, which were well protected by armed men, and by otherwise allying themselves with local chieftains. Many a Fujiwara noble himself sought the provincial governorship, settled his male relatives, and implanted his influence, especially in regions north and east of Kyōto.[48] Such was the condition about 900.

Thereafter, with the parallel extension of immunity and commendation, we may note more and more warriors included in the *shō*. Some had themselves been commendors of land; others had been invested with *shiki* by the legal owners of estates.[49] We may suppose that, in the latter class of cases, the employment of warriors as agents of the *shō* was opportune as protection against the prevailing disorder, for the warrior in the *shō* would be as efficient for its security as he would be dangerous out of the *shō* as a marauder. He probably served also as a safeguard against the original commendors, who, as the actual possessors of the land, had often shown little scruple, when they were able, to terminate their agreements with the nominal owners and enter into contractual relations with other nobles or temples.[50] It should be remembered, however, that nearly all the owners of the *shō* under whom warriors served as stewards and agents still belonged either to the civil nobility or to the clergy, and that there as yet existed no military nobility.

[48] See the vivid story told a little later of a Fujiwara chieftain in Etchū in *Kon-zhaku mono-gatari*, vol. XXVI., no. 17. His descendants lorded over the three adjoining provinces.

[49] The case of the contiguous *shō* of Kamino, Makuni, and Sarukawa, is typical. They grew around cultivated tracts that had been commended before the twelfth century to a monastery by their warrior-owners. From this time to the beginning of the fourteenth century, numerous documents reveal the descendants of the commendors and other armed men as "residents" (*jū-nin*), "land-holders" (*ji-nushi*), and *hyaku-shō* (bearers of family-names ?), these terms being often used interchangeably. Some of them acted as representatives of their rank; some were appointed as agents (often faithless) of the monastery. Many of the actual tillers of the soil were in a servile position. See *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, I., doc. nos. 447–450; VII., doc. nos. 1581, 1583–1590, 1592–1600, 1604, 1607–1608, 1610, 1612, 1615, 1619, 1623–1624.

[50] In 1106, an agent of Kasawara *shō* was dismissed for an offense, and, in his chagrin, commended the *shō* to a temple.

V.

The tenth century was just witnessing the beginning of a new class of nobility which was military almost from the date of its birth —though its military character was essentially private—and which rose in influence with rapidity in the next century and a half. Certain political and economic exigencies of the court impelled many members of the imperial family, from the early eighth century on, to renounce their privilege, to assume new family-names, and to become nobles of inferior rank. Of these, the more ambitious at once sought fortune away from the capital, after the tenth century, both as local officials, whose terms they helped to make hereditary,[51] and as managers of great *shō*.[52] In the latter capacity, the position of the new nobles, living as they did on the ground, was certain to become much stronger than that of the absentee civil owners of the *shō*. In both capacities—as governors of *kuni* and as stewards of *shō*—the new nobles were armed men, for to arms the times had driven all men of ambition in the provinces. During the tenth century, the military nobles, though in the main belonging to the two families Minamoto and Taira, were, as was revealed at the rebellion of Masakado in 939–940, still largely unorganized, and their alliance with the local warriors, who had first grown up independently of them, was still limited though increasing. The military nobility was as yet hardly in a position to cope with the civil nobility.

The situation changed rapidly from the eleventh century, when the increasing restlessness among all classes of the people impelled the more active men to unmake and remake alliances in manners that seemed to suit their interest best. The actual possessors of the *shō*, who had once commended their land to civil nobles or temples, now largely transferred similar *shiki* to military nobles;[53] and the deed was done with ease, as the *shiki* were in the process of becoming more flexible and divisible than ever. The mutual advantage of the new arrangement seemed evident, for thereby the possessor,

[51] The first Taira (899), the first Minamoto (first half of the tenth century), and their sons, all filled posts in the local government, to say nothing of their descendants.

[52] To cite only two instances from the tenth century. Hidesato was steward of the strategic Tawara *shō*, while being constable of Shimotsuke, and in this double capacity was a powerful tool in eastern Japan in the hands of the Fujiwara nobles. Mitsunaka, a provincial governor, managed Tada *shō*, and was a faithful servant to his Fujiwara chiefs.

[53] Already in 1091 the government at Kyōto forbade the people in the provinces, with little effect, to make further commendations of landed rights to the Minamoto chief. *Hyaku-ren shō*, V., in *Koku-shi tai-kei*, XIV. 55. From the early years of the next century similar prohibitions were as frequent as unavailing.

who was himself a warrior, secured a new master who was always at hand, affording constant protection and manifesting kindred interest and sympathy, and under whose growing prestige it was an honor to serve; the warrior-lord, too, was enabled by this method to include more land and more men under his control. Actual warfare, which was then becoming frequent, accelerated the process once so naturally begun. For during the protracted campaigns in the north, the men were thrown together in a close relationship; even in those local warriors who had joined the expedition merely from motives of opportunism was gradually engendered a feeling of personal loyalty to the chieftains; while the latter's interest had become increasingly bound up with that of the warrior class as a whole as against the civil nobility. Landed possessions and personal following grew henceforth in a rapid process of accretion; the private organization of men and land gained, on the one hand, in hierarchical unity under the impetus of the revived spirit of clannism, and, on the other, in complex divisions of families and their *shiki* in land.

We shall not discuss here the personal side of the new relationship—the forms of fealty and protection between lord and vassal, and the question of the knight's service. What should specially be noted is the effect of the social changes upon land tenure.

First, let us consider the position of the military lord serving as protector and manager of a *shō* nominally owned by a temple or a civil noble of the court. The former was an invested agent of the latter, and his position was accordingly precarious in principle; the *shiki* which the manager enjoyed were presumed to have originally been granted as a favor, not as a reward for service; and the charter creating his tenure and his own acknowledgment of the charter explicitly stated that his office would terminate with a lapse from duteous conduct.[54] However, even the tillers and their chiefs, employed, as they were, for the mere economic exploitation of the soil, whose servile tenure was stated as revocable when they failed in duty, are seen to have often held their place, after the twelfth century, by heredity. For the manager, who supervised these men, there were, as a matter of course, circumstances which deprived his tenure of its seeming precariousness. He was himself a noble, and, as such, usually found benefice in an extensive *shō*[55] comprising

[54] Even so late as in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the charters and acknowledgments of military managerships of ecclesiastical *shō* were often plainly precarious in expression. See, *e. g.*, those of 1363, in *Iwashimidzu mon-zho*, I. 283; and of 1359 and 1462–1463, in *Tō-zhi hyaku-go mon-zho*, MSS., part *ro*.

[55] A striking instance is that of the great *shō* of Shimadzu in southern Kyūshū. About 1025 a local official cultivated a tract in this region, and com-

numerous tracts and people of diverse origins and conditions; his authority as manager of affairs and leader of armed men was necessarily great. When he was, in addition, an hereditary high official of a province, and, as often happened, had the management of many *shō* within its confines,[56] his position was commanding. Even in a less pretentious place, he usually gathered about him relatives and other dependents that, along with his sworn men, squatted on the *shō*-all of whom he could mobilize at an instant's notice. The civil noble at Kyōto would think twice before interfering with his agent in the country whose post seemed so impregnable. The latter showed at times a disposition to invade neighboring estates for purposes of plunder at the head of hundreds of mounted warriors; might not the same force perhaps be turned against the nominal master at court? The position of the chief as manager, therefore, was far from precarious, was often stronger than a contractual tenure, and was perforce hereditary, as was also that of the many men under his military control who would rise and fall with their lord. All this had come about by an irresistible force of necessity, in which the civil and religious owners of the *shō* had no choice but to acquiesce.

Consider, next, the case of the small warrior serving under a military noble who was either the manager or the owner of the *shō*. His relation to the lord was either that of a commendor and possessor of land or that of a beneficed servant. The distinction between these two kinds of status was indeed maintained at least till the end of the Kamakura period in the early fourteenth century. During that same period, however, the growing tendency was toward the gradual approach of the tenure of possession to the more precarious tenure of the invested *shiki* in land. In the feudal official manual of 1232, the hereditary possession of the immediate

mended it to the regent Yorimichi, reserving for himself and his descendants the right of its financial management. Gradually annexing estates of different origins and tenures, the *shō* came to include the greater part of the three provinces, Satsuma, Ōsumi, and Hyūga, comprising a variety of possessors and beneficed agents. Of these agents, a family which assumed the name Shimadzu became conspicuous toward the end of the twelfth century as the managers-general of the entire *shō*. During the troublous fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Shimadzu succeeded in reducing their rivals within the vast *shō* and making themselves its sole possessors. In this position they were respected and feared by the Tokugawa shogunate all during its rule after 1600, and finally were instrumental in accomplishing its downfall in 1867–1868.

[56] As a result of subtle divisions of real rights, civil and religious owners often found it convenient to bundle several *shō* that were near together and to place over them a military manager. Not infrequently Minamoto and Taira chiefs in this way had the management of all the *shō* in whole districts and provinces, of which they were governors for generations.

vassal of the suzerain, but not his beneficed *shiki*, might be transferred by sale;[57] from 1270 onward, neither could be so conveyed,[58] while both could, as before, be divided and bequeathed among children—the law of primogeniture not having as yet been fully established—and be subinfeudated.[59] This trend of assimilating the two tenures and bringing about a gradual evolution of a tenure less free than the one and less precarious than the other, that came to a marked stage in the thirteenth century and completed itself in the fifteenth and sixteenth, may, it is surmised, have shown its faint beginnings in the early period under our discussion.[60] It would seem probable that in the personal relation in military service between manager-lord and vassal, the latter as a commendor and possessor of land could not, even in this early period, be nearly as independent as he had been under the absentee civil or religious master; while, as a beneficed servant, he would be likely to be treated with more consideration by his new lord, for the former's service was deemed honorable, was akin to that of the latter, and was directly needed in as efficient a form as possible.

To sum up the foregoing discussion. The fiscal immunity of "imperial", "granted", and "temple" lands induced the commendation of taxable land and people into growing private estates. The state, seeing its sources of revenue and power fast dwindling away, itself adopted the methods of the nobility and clergy to administer public affairs much as if they were private concerns. The inveterate habit of the political mind of the pre-Reform age seemed to have returned in full vitality. In their disposition of the rights and facts relating to land, the Japanese displayed their genius in an arrangement of remarkable flexibility with a large capacity for compromise. And this very condition made it a matter of ease for a firm hold on private land to be established by the warrior, another illegal creation of the age unforeseen by the Reformers. A little later arose a military nobility, which, in a century and a half, made itself the central power by the double method of serving, on the one hand, as the political and proprietary agents of the civil nobility at Kyōto, and, on the other, of assuming lordship over the warriors in the country. As agent, the military noble approached the position of the possessor of the land in his charge; as lord, he was tending to make the ten-

[57] *Jō-ei shiki-moku, c.* XLVIII.

[58] *Shin-pen tsui-ka,* c. LXV., LXXVII., LXXIV., LXXV.

[59] See note 39 above.

[60] I have been unable to substantiate this surmise from the available contemporary sources, which relate chiefly to civil and ecclesiastical *shō* and rarely to those of military ownership. I hold the theory as a probable supposition till I may find it either confirmed or disproved by fresh evidence.

ures of his commendor-vassal and of his beneficed vassal alike a favor in theory, though in practice a reward, alike accompanying a military service, and alike hereditary and divisible, though inalienable by sale. In short, the military noble was in the process of becoming the lord of a fief capable of subinfeudation. The process was slow to mature, for the civil and religious estates still persisted, though in decreasing numbers, and continued to offer some resistance to the encroachment of the new tenure; the complete assimilation of the land of Japan into the feudal tenure was not effected until the sixteenth century, and was quickly followed by another development. We suspect, however, that, when all the sources shall some day be brought to light, beginnings of the long process may perhaps be discerned as early as in the period ending in 1186.

VI.

We have sketched the main outlines of the evolution of landed institutions before the advent of the feudal régime. It now remains to touch very briefly upon the general movement of historical events in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which hastened the processes that have been described and which culminated in the inception of the régime in 1186.

In the eleventh century, social unrest had become more organized as the military forces of the great warrior-clans were better co-ordinated, and broke out in serious insurrections, in 1028, 1052–1061, and 1088–1091. Most of the leaders of the rebels were men of the new nobility, and were vanquished only by other men of their class commanding their own warriors. The enervated civil nobles at Kyōto were Buddhists of the old type and abhorred the sight of blood. They were compelled to depend on the Minamoto and Taira, not only for the suppression of local disorders, but also in their mutual rivalry and intrigue for power. The military nobles were not only establishing their influence in the country, but also becoming a decisive factor in the political struggles at Kyōto; they were not only owners and stewards of *shō*, but also indispensable tools for the Fujiwara nobles and imperial aspirants for supremacy at court, to whom the warlords had sold their temporary fealty.

Events since the early eleventh century resulted in driving the Minamoto and Taira clans to organize themselves in larger and larger groups, finally dividing military Japan between them into two distinct spheres of influence, the Minamoto in the east and the Taira in the west. Presently, the political factions at the capital, which employed the arms of the two clans, came twice to a sharp conflict, in 1156 and in 1160, that decided the ascendancy of

the Taira for a brief quarter of a century, to be followed by a more complete and lasting supremacy of the Minamoto. In this swift flight of events, the civil nobility was thrust into the background as a political factor and dispossessed of many of its landed estates, the power of the great temples was curbed, and the fortune of military families rose and fell with tragic rapidity. The real rights of *shō* changed hands on large scales,[61] the warriors in the meantime gaining an extended control over them; vassals transferred their allegiance in large numbers and with frequency; and the immunity of the *shō*, especially of those owned by warriors, usually amounted to political autonomy. Finally, in 1186, Minamoto-no-Yoritomo compelled the reluctant imperial government to sanction his appointing his own vassals as constables in all the provinces, and as stewards of all the *shō*, civil, religious, and military,[62] in Japan. With this her feudal rule may be said to have begun.

K. Asakawa.

[61] The Taira appointed their vassals as stewards, not only over their own *shō*, but also over civil and religious *shō* (see *Adzuma kagami*, V., in *Zoku koku-shi tai-kei*, IV. 197), and over the *shō* confiscated from their former lords. The family is said to have held governorships of 36 out of the 66 provinces of Japan, and controlled [*shiki* of] more than 500 *shō*, besides innumerable minor estates. All these extensive *shiki* were confiscated from the *Taira* at their downfall, and passed under the control of the Minamoto.

[62] Beginning shortly after 1186, the newly appointed stewards (*ji-tō*) seem to have been gradually withdrawn from some of the civil and ecclesiastical *shō*. (See, for example, the withdrawal in 1227 from the *shō* belonging to a monastery, in *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, VII. 182, 253.) The suzerain, however, continued to hold, through the new constables (*shu-go*), the military and police power over all the provinces, which comprised within them all the existent *shō*.

THE GOVERNMENT OF NORMANDY UNDER HENRY II.[1]

I.

In the great Plantagenet empire of the twelfth century Normandy held the central place, mediating historically, as well as geographically, between the England which it had conquered a century earlier and the Angevin and Aquitanian lands which shared its Frankish traditions and were beginning to feel with it the nascent centripetal power of the French monarchy. The beginnings of this empire were the result of Norman initiative, and upon Normandy fell the brunt of the attacks under which it collapsed. Yet Normandy, though central, was not dominant. It was bound to its neighbors, not merely by a personal union, but by a common imperial policy, by certain elements of a common administration, and by constant communication and interchange of officials; and it took its place by their side as a member of the strongest and most remarkable state of its time. Be our interest military or economic, ecclesiastical or constitutional, we cannot hope to understand any part of this realm without constant reference to the other parts and to the whole. What is true of the several countries is true of their sovereign. Henry II. has too often been viewed merely as an English king, yet he was born and educated on the Continent, began to rule on the Continent, and spent a large part of his later life in his Continental dominions. He was, of course, not a foreigner, as was William the Conqueror, and England had a share in forming him which it had not in the making of his great-grandfather; yet he is not a national figure, either English or French—he is international, if not cosmopolitan.

It is natural that Henry's reign should have been most thoroughly studied in the land where his descendants still rule, but it is significant of his wider influence that the Continental relations of his legal reforms were first clearly seen by a German jurist, and that the greatest French scholar of our time should have begun his long life of labor with a study of Henry's financial administration and closed it by dedicating to the Continental documents of his reign a masterly volume of the *Chartes et Diplômes relatifs à l'Histoire de*

[1] In a briefer form, this paper was read before the International Congress of Historical Studies at London in April, 1913.

France. Where Brunner and Delisle are masters, one can do no more than follow; yet this period of Norman history is not exhausted, as Professor Powicke has recently shown us, and one may still seek to contribute a bit of new evidence or a new suggestion to the understanding of what will always be a reign of uncommon interest. In presenting the results of any such study much depends on the point of view. When the institutions of Normandy approach those of its Continental neighbors, they will impress the English student more than they impress the French, while other elements which seem familiar and hence commonplace to an English writer become highly significant when seen against a Continental background. The point of view of the present paper is English in the sense that it examines the government of Normandy under Henry II. particularly for light which may be thrown upon the government of England in the same period, and, while it is based upon an independent exploration of the available evidence, it will pass lightly over matters which are already well established[2] or which, like the fiscal system, are interesting chiefly by way of contrast to Continental conditions.

The great obstacle to any careful study of Normandy in the twelfth century is the paucity of original information, especially as contrasted with the wealth of record in contemporary England. For Henry's reign the only Norman chronicle is that of Robert of Torigni,[3] pieced out by occasional local annals and by the casual references of English writers to Norman affairs, and there is little to add in the form of letters[4] or other literary remains. Over against the splendid series of the Pipe Rolls, unbroken after 1155, Normandy can show only the Exchequer Roll of 1180 and two fragments of 1184.[5] There is no *Dialogue on the Exchequer* and no Glanvill, and

[2] For the fiscal system Delisle's study, "Des Revenus publics en Normandie au XII^e^ Siècle", *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* X., XI., XIII., is still fundamental. For legal matters Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie et sa Cour,* is useful, though inadequate in its use of materials and at times too juristic. Powicke's *Loss of Normandy,* supplemented at certain points by his articles in the *English Historical Review* (XXI. 635–649, XXII. 15–42), gives the best survey of the Angevin period but treats constitutional matters less fully than other aspects of the subject.

[3] Cited from Delisle's edition (Société de l'Histoire de Normandie, Rouen, 1872–1873).

[4] The letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, for example, are disappointing.

[5] Cited from the edition of Stapleton, *Magni Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae sub Regibus Angliae* (London, 1840–1844); the second fragment of 1184 from Delisle's *Henri II.,* pp. 334–344. That the Exchequer had other types of rolls appears from the notice of 1186 printed by Delisle, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions,* XXIV. 2, 353; and by Valin, p. 278.

the earliest custumal is not earlier than 1199.[6] The charters are fairly numerous, in originals, in cartulary copies, or in the *vidimus* of French kings, and an admirable basis for their study now exists in Léopold Delisle's *Introduction,*[7] soon to be followed by the publication of the full texts; yet of those here analyzed the four hundred or more which relate to Normandy are an insignificant part of the thousands which once existed and from which it would have been possible to reconstruct the whole course of administrative and judicial procedure in the Norman state. The charters of bishops and barons and lesser persons are more numerous and offer much to reward the investigator of local and family history and of legal and economic relations, but they too often tell us what we least want to know, and the result of prolonged explorations is in many respects disappointing.

Equally fatal is the loss of Henry's Norman legislation. At best, as Maitland has reminded us,[8] his law-making was done in an informal fashion and has left few monuments, even in England, and for Normandy the only formal ordinances that have been preserved are the Continental prototypes of the Assize of Arms and the regulations concerning the Saladin tithe.[9] Here again time has dealt unkindly with records which are known to have existed. The Bec annalist tells of the Christmas court at Falaise in 1159, whose acts he evidently had before him in writing his provokingly meagre summary,[10] and three years later we hear of a Lenten assembly at Rouen which seems to have had legislative importance.[11] There was probably, as we shall see, some specific assize establishing the use of the recognition, and tenure by *parage* seems to have been introduced by a definite statute.[12] Now and then, in an age when no line was drawn between legislation and adjudication, there are instances of general enactments in the form of judicial decisions.[13]

[6] Tardif, *Le Très Ancien Coutumier,* in his *Coutumiers de Normandie,* I. (Rouen, 1881).

[7] *Recueil des Actes de Henri II. Roi d' Angleterre et Duc de Normandie concernant les Provinces Françaises et les Affaires de France, Introduction* (with a fascicle of facsimiles, Paris, 1909). Unless otherwise indicated, references to Delisle are to this volume.

[8] *History of English Law* (second ed.), I. 136. On the legislation of the dukes of Normandy see Tardif, *Étude sur les Sources de l'Ancien Droit Normand,* read before the Congrès du Millénaire in 1911, of which the part covering Henry II. has not yet appeared.

[9] Benedict of Peterborough, I. 269, II. 30. *Cf.* also the general ordinance concerning the debts of Crusaders issued at Verneuil in 1177, *ibid.,* I. 194.

[10] Robert of Torigni, II. 180.

[11] *Ibid.,* I. 336.

[12] Powicke, *Loss of Normandy,* p. 69.

[13] See Robert of Torigni, II. 241; the various reforms attributed to William Fitz Ralph in the *Très Ancien Coutumier,* cc. 60–65; and the following unpublished example from an original in the Archives of the Manche, H. 3 (1165–1179):

Next to the Exchequer Rolls, the fullest information respecting Norman institutions under Henry was contained in the returns from the great general inquests ordered at different occasions in his reign. One of these, the inquest of 1172 concerning military tenures, has long been known and used, but for the others we have little more than a bare mention.[13] In Normandy, as later in England, the new ruler began at once the gradual recovery of the lost portions of his demesne through the machinery of the sworn inquest; and we have record of such inquests held at Caen before 1154 to determine the duke's rights at Bayeux,[14] and, then or shortly afterward, throughout the Bessin,[15] while in 1163 two of his justices made inquiry, diocese by diocese, concerning the rents and customs pertaining to the duke and his barons.[16] This was not entirely effectual, and in 1171 the income of the duchy was almost doubled by an inquest held throughout Normandy to ascertain the lands and forest and other portions of the demesne which had been occupied since the death of Henry I.[17] Of this systematic survey we are fortunate in having, besides the references in the Exchequer Rolls[18] and possible indications in cartularies[19] and in the *Coutumier des Forêts* of Hector of Chartres,[20] the

"Reverentissimo patri suo et domino carissimo R. Rothomagensi archiepiscopo et omnibus hoc audientibus et recte iudicantibus Willelmus de Sola salutem. Testimonium cuiusdam donationis quam feci monachis de Alneto vobis per litteras meas significare curavi. Habebam quondam in manu mea et adhuc habere poteram si voluissem duas garbas decime in parrochia de Bono Fosseio ex quibus unam dedi monachis et aliam ecclesie eiusdem ville, persona vero ecclesie suam terciam garbam habuit sibi in pace et habet. Verum tunc temporis talis erat consuetudo circa nos quod tercia tantum garba reddebatur persone, de illis scilicet terris que pro campardo tradebantur, due vero cum eodem campardo tenebantur, que nunc Deo donante et domino rege nostro iudicante ubique in territoriis nostris redduntur, quas monachi et ecclesia in suam partem volunt habere. Quod quidem rectissimum videtur sed persona contradicit ill[is]. Quam contentionem declarandam domino Ricardo Constantiensi episcopo commiseram et non semel aut secundo me donationem attestante coram ipso iudicium distulit facere. Qua de causa monachi in eius curia aggravati cum Gaufrido milite persona vestram appellaverunt presentiam. Unde obnixe vestram deprecor auctoritatem quatinus vos pro Deo quod unicuique pertinet et persone et monachis et ecclesie recta consideratione restituatis. Valete."

[14] *Livre Noir de Bayeux*, nos. 13, 138; Delisle, Table, no. 72*.

[15] *Livre Noir*, no. 35; Delisle, no. 34.

[16] Robert of Torigni, I. 344.

[17] *Ibid.*, II. 28.

[18] Indicated by the phrase "recuperatus per iuream", Stapleton, *Magni Rotuli, passim.*

[19] Notably in the cartulary of Fécamp (Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie*, p. 269; Round, *Calendar of Documents preserved in France*, no. 137; Delisle, no. 213), where there is a reference to the rights of the duke as recognized and recorded in his roll; and in the Bayeux cartularies (*Livre Noir*, no. 46; *Livre Rouge*, no. 46), where the phrase "recognitum autem fuit" shows that an extract has been made from a more comprehensive document. Being subsequent to the accession

full returns for the *vicomté* of the Avranchin,[21] which give us an exact picture of the king's rights and his administration in this district. Perhaps we may connect with the same inquest a still more important document of Henry's reign, the so-called *iurea regalis,* preserved in the *Très Ancien Coutumier*[22] and containing a statement of the duke's reserved jurisdiction and his rights over wardship, *craspice,* wreck, and treasure trove. Ducal example, if not ducal precept, is doubtless responsible for the exact surveys of the possessions of religious houses which were made in this reign and of which the chief Norman instance is the detailed inquest on the manors of La Trinité de Caen.[23] The military inquest of 1172[24] was a natural consequence of the English inquiry of 1166, itself perhaps suggested by Sicilian precedents,[25] but, save in the case of the Bishop

of Bishop Henry in 1165, the Bayeux document is not a part of the earlier inquests for this district nor connected with the general inquest of 1163, and the mention of William Fitz John seems to place it before the close of 1172 (see, on the date of his death, Delisle, p. 480, where it should be observed that the entry of 1180 refers to an old account). The portion of the original inquest which concerned the king would naturally be omitted in drawing up a statement for the benefit of the bishop.

[20] Preserved in the archives of the Seine-Inférieure; see Prévost, *Étude sur la Forêt de Roumare* (Rouen, 1904), pp. 354–365. The numerous references to Henry in the *Coutumier* which appeared to Beaurepaire (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* LXVII. 508) to point to a general inquest on the forests, seem rather to cite his charters.

[21] Printed by Delisle, pp. 345–347. *Cf.* Powicke, in *English Historical Review,* XXV. 710 f.; and for the date, Haskins, *ibid.,* XXVI. 326–328.

[22] Tardif, pp. 59–65. The *iurea* cannot be later than the death of William Patric in 1174, and it is anterior to 1172 if we accept Warner's date for the death of William Fitz John (*supra,* note 19); but there is nothing to connect it with any one year, and it may belong with the inquest of 1163 or with the earlier inquiries in the Bessin. In any case, in spite of its general form, it was the result of a local inquest, for all the jurors are in some way connected with the Bessin and the statement concerning the fishing rights of the Bishop of Bayeux and the Earl of Chester points to the same region. That William Fitz John was connected with earlier inquests in the Bessin (note 74) is pointed out by Tardif (*Étude sur les Sources,* p. 12), who, however, knows nothing of the inquest of 1171, in which year William was also justiciar (Round, no. 456; *Mémoires des Antiquaires de Normandie,* XV. 198).

[23] MS. Lat. 5650, ff. 60 v.–87, where the mention of William de Hummet (f. 82) shows that the inquests belong to the latter part of this reign and not to the earlier half of the century, as suggested by Legras, *Le Bourgage de Caen,* p. 37, note. The whole is to be published by R. N. Sauvage in the *Bibliothèque de Droit Normand.* English examples of monastic inquests in this period are those of the *Ramsey Cartulary,* III. 224–314; the inquest of 1181 in the *Domesday of St. Paul's*; and the Glastonbury inquisition of 1189.

[24] *Historiens de France,* XXIII. 693–699; *Red Book of the Exchequer,* pp. 624–647. On the text see Powicke, in *English Historical Review,* XXVI. 89–93; on the importance of the document for the history of the Norman baronage, see his *Loss of Normandy,* pp. 482–520.

[25] See my discussion in the *English Historical Review,* XXVI. 661–664.

of Bayeux[26] and the Abbot of Mont St. Michel,[27] we have only the general summary and not, as in the parallel English case, the original returns made by the tenants.

It would be especially interesting to know in some detail the history of Henry's early years as duke, not only because of their importance in forming the youth who was at twenty-one to become ruler of the vast Angevin empire, but also because we might then study the institutions of the duchy and the policy of its ruler before the union with England reopened the way to possible modification from without. Unfortunately the forty charters which constitute our sole source for the period from 1150 to 1154 give few answers to the many questions we should like to put. So far as they tell us anything, they show the young duke surrounded by his father's advisers and maintaining his father's policy, itself a continuation of the system of Henry I.,[28] but we can also discern certain new names which are to rise to importance in the ensuing period. Reginald of St. Valéry is still seneschal,[29] and so are Robert de Courcy, Robert de Neufbourg,[30] and Richard de la Haie;[31] but Manasses Bisset and Humphrey de Bohun also appear with this title,[32] while William the Marshal, Richard de Hummet the Constable,[33] and Warin Fitz Gerald the Chamberlain[34] are new. Beside Richard de Bohun, who

[26] *Mémoires des Antiquaires,* VIII. 425–431; *Historiens de France,* XXIII. 699–702. These returns were based on the inquest of 1133 and represent still earlier conditions, *English Historical Review,* XXII. 643 f.

[27] Robert of Torigni, II. 296–303; *Historiens de France,* XXIII. 703–705.

[28] *English Historical Review,* XXVII. 436–444. The following writ for Heauville, a priory of Marmoutier, is, save for the witnesses and the insertion of *avi mei,* an exact repetition of a writ of Geoffrey for the same establishment: "H. dux Normannorum et comes Andegavensium episcopo Constantinensi et iusticiis et vicecomitibus et baronibus Constantini salutem. Precipio et volo quod monachi sancti Martini Maiorismonasterii de Heauvilla teneant omnes terras et ecclesias et decimas et omnes res suas que pertinent ad elemosinam meam de Heauvilla ita bene et in pace et honorifice et iuste et quiete sicut melius et quietius tenuerunt tempore regis H. avi mei. Et nemo eis vel rebus eorum ullam iniuriam vel contumeliam faciat. Testibus Wilelmo de Angervilla et Hugone de Longo Campo apud Argentomum." Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection de Touraine, XXXI. 57, no. 7 (no. 8 is the writ of Geoffrey); not in Delisle.

[29] See the list of witnesses to Henry's early charters in Delisle, pp. 133 f., where, however, the official titles are not always given and no distinction is made between Normandy and Anjou.

[30] Robert de Neufbourg is not called seneschal in documents before 1155, but his activity as justice and his precedence in charters make it probable that he held this dignity also under Geoffrey and during the early years of Henry. See *English Historical Review,* XXVII. 437.

[31] *Ibid.*; *Livre Noir,* no. 7.

[32] *Livre Noir,* nos. 13, 138; *cf.* Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward,* p. 37.

[33] *Livre Noir,* nos. 13, 138; Round, no. 523. Humphrey Fitz Odo and William of Roumare also appear as constables, Delisle, pp. 127, 510, no. *40.

[34] *Livre Noir,* nos. 14, 40, 138.

continues to act as chancellor, we find another chancellor, William,[35] and a chancellor's clerk and keeper of the seal, Maurice,[36] who need clearing up. The most notable among these new men is the clever and ambitious Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux, who heads the lists of witnesses to Henry's charters and the list of justices in his *curia*,[37] thus restoring the office of justiciar which his predecessor Bishop John had held under Henry I. and which had disappeared under Geoffrey. Of humbler servants we find Odo *hostiarius*, doubtless the usher of this name who appears in the Pipe Rolls and perhaps the Odo of Falaise, *regiorum computator redituum*, who was cured of blindness at the tomb of Becket.[38] The *curia* meets in different parts of Normandy[39]—Rouen, Lisieux, Domfront—and has its share of judicial business: there the Abbot of Aunay proved his right to the church of Cenilly, the Abbot of Fécamp to his tithes in the neighboring forest, the Abbot of Savigny to the land claimed by Robert Fitz Ralph.[40] We get glimpses of a body of justices busy with the holding of sworn inquests and the protection of legal rights;[41] and there are local *vicomtes* and *baillis* and porters, all receiving their orders in the sharp, crisp language of the Anglo-Norman writ.[42]

So far as the sources of information are concerned, the period from 1154 to 1189 is divided into two almost equal parts by the change of the king's style in 1172–1173, which separates his charters into two groups, according as they do or do not contain the words *Dei gratia* in the title.[43] These groups do not differ notably in number, but the materials for the second half of the reign are the fuller, since the charters are there re-enforced by the Exchequer Rolls and by a larger number of records of judicial decisions. The earlier period is, however, the more interesting from a constitutional

[35] Delisle, p. 88, note. I do not understand why Delisle dismisses the early chancellors with bare mention in a foot-note; certainly Henry's chancery does not begin its history in 1154.

[36] Round, nos. 820, 1058, 1407.

[37] See especially *Livre Noir*, nos. 7, 13, 138; *Cartulaire de S. Ymer*, no. 6. For the disappearance of the justiciarship under Geoffrey see *English Historical Review*, XXVII. 436.

[38] He witnesses a charter in the cartulary of Mortemer, p. 59 (Delisle, no. *36). For Odo of Falaise see *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, II. 185.

[39] Delisle, nos. *30, *63, *71; Robert of Torigni, I. 255, 259. *Cf.*, also, the large gathering at Bayeux in November, 1151, Delisle, p. 122.

[40] Delisle, nos. *30, *63, *71; Round, nos. 127, 523, 826.

[41] *Livre Noir*, nos. 7, 13, 14, 138; *Cartulaire de S. Ymer*, no. 6; Round, nos. 12, 127, 516, 523, 821.

[42] Delisle, nos. *16, *36, and p. 126; *Livre Noir*, no. 40; Round, nos. 109, 516, 1406.

[43] Delisle, pp. 12–38.

point of view as being a period of origins, and this is notably true of the years between 1154 and 1164, preliminary to the struggle with the Church and the great legislative measures of the reign in England but as yet little known as regards conditions on either side of the Channel. The possibility of Norman precedents, especially in matters of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and civil procedure, requires a careful sifting of all the information that has reached us from what seems to have been a formative period in Henry's policy.

Let us first consider the administration of justice. Of the judicial business that came before the duke himself in his *curia* we have only the slightest indications,[44] and these tell us next to nothing in the earlier years. Between 1154 and 1164 the king spent half his time in England, while the affairs of his other dominions claimed many of the busy months he passed on the Continent. If Normandy was to have an effective judicial system, it must be organized to work in the king's long absences as well as under his immediate supervision. From his father and grandfather Henry inherited the institution of a regular body of justices, both in the *curia* and in local affairs, which he had only to develop and adapt to the needs of a rapidly expanding ducal jurisdiction. In this process there was doubtless constant experimentation, both with men and with methods, such as we can follow somewhat more closely in England later in the reign; but for the earlier years the Norman evidence happens to be fully as abundant as the English,[45] and shows us some features of the system with reasonable clearness.

First of all there is a distinction between the ordinary justices and the justiciar of Normandy, *iusticia mea Normannie*.[46] Ordinarily, as under Henry I.,[47] there would seem to have been two justiciars, a bishop and the chief seneschal, who frequently sit together, but at least five persons are known to have acted in this capacity in this period, and the available sources do not enable us to fix their succession and relation to one another with the precision which has sometimes been sought.[48] As under Geoffrey,[49] the courts

[44] *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198; Delisle, p. 43; *infra*, note 56.

[45] For which see Stubbs, introduction to Benedict of Peterborough, II. lxiv.

[46] Notably in the clause of the king's writs, "nisi feceris iusticia mea Normannie faciat fieri", Round, nos. 44, 205, 492, 949; *Livre Noir*, nos. 12, 36 (*cf.* no. 37, of Henry I.). In other writs we find in the same clause only *iusticia mea*. Round, nos. 544, 882; *Livre Noir*, nos. 9, 10, 35. The substitution of a justice's name (*e. g.*, Round, nos. 127, 516, 523; *Livre Noir*, nos. 27, 28), accordingly, does not show that he was one of the chief justiciars.

[47] *English Historical Review*, XXIV. 218.

[48] Notably by Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward*, pp. 43–50. His attempt to sustain his theory of the unimportance of the seneschal by explaining away the dapifership of Robert de Neufbourg has been satisfactorily disposed of

held by the justiciars are called assizes,[50] often, by way of distinction from the lesser courts, full assizes (*plena assisia*);[51] and if we may judge from a full assize held at Caen in 1157 and attended by the barons from the four great regions of the west,[52] they comprehended several administrative districts. Meetings at Caen and Rouen are frequent, but not sufficiently regular to indicate the existence of a permanent central *curia,* and the justiciars are clearly itinerant. The lack of any rolls prevents our tracing their circuits, but the records of cases are more numerous than those which have been collected for England in the same period.[53] In 1155, before the king had returned from his coronation, Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux and Robert of Neufbourg the chief seneschal, as master justices of all Normandy, hold assizes at Carentan and Domfront.[54] In 1157 they appear in two judgments of the *curia* at Caen,[55] and about the same time in another proceeding, likewise at Caen, in part of which the Bishop of Lisieux is in his absence replaced by two barons.[56]

by Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie,* pp. 157–158. The charter of Henry II. for Savigny (Round, no. 824), in which Harcourt considers Robert's style "unofficial embellishment", is also in the Cartulaire de Normandie, f. 80 v. *Cf.* Delisle, p. 279.

[49] "In assisia mea apud Valonias", American Historical Review, VIII. 630.

[50] Robert of Torigni, II. 241; *Mémoires des Antiquaires,* XV.197. See Henry's writ in *Livre Noir,* no. 10, given "quando fui apud Baiocas ad assisiam meam", and directing William Patric to be "ad primam assisam que erit citra Lexovios" (anterior to 1172–1173, Delisle, no. 211).

[51] "In plena assisia apud Abrincas", Deville, *Analyse d'un Ancien Cartulaire de S. Étienne,* p. 18; Valin, p. 268. "In plena assisia apud Rothomagum", cartulary of Préaux, no. 18; cartulary of St. Evroul, no. 172. "In plena assisia apud Argentomum", *ibid.,* no. 250 (1190).

[52] "In plenaria curia regis, utpote in assisa ubi erant barones iiii comitatuum", Robert of Torigni, II. 251.

[53] On conditions in England, see Pollock and Maitland, I. 156.

[54] Robert of Torigni, II. 241.

[55] *Ibid.,* II. 251; *Mémoires des Antiquaires,* XV. 197 (original in Archives of the Orne, H. 3912).

[56] "Robertus de Novoburgo sinescallus Normannie archiepiscopo Rothomagensi et episcopis Normannie et consulibus et baronibus et omnibus fidelibus Henrici regis Anglie salutem. Notum vobis fieri volumus quod Robertus filius Radulfi de Thaun Cadomo in curia regis coram me qui eram iusticia Normannie et coram baronibus regis Ricardo abbati et monachis Savigneii reddidit in pace ac dimisit et in manu abbatis posuit decimas terre eorum de Thaun et quatuor acras terre quas ipse Robertus et fratres eius adversus abbatem et monachos antea calumniabantur et quas ipse abbas et monachi disrationaverunt in curia regis et coram ipso ad Danfront et de chatallis suis misit se in miseratione abbatis et monachorum pro malefactis que ipse et fratres eius fecerant eis. Et pepigit legitime quod faceret si posset fratres suos facere et tenere eundem finem cum abbate et monachis quem ipse faciebat, et si non posset quod legitime se teneret cum abbate et monachis contra fratres, et affidavit in manu mea et iuravit super sancta quod ipse hec omnia que hic diximus legitime teneret et conservaret abbati et monachis. Et hoc ipsum affidavit Vitalis de sancto Germano et Ricardus de Babainvilla et alii amici eius quos abbas voluit. Huius finis et pacis inter

Before his death in 1159 we find Robert de Neufbourg in various other cases at Avranches, Bayeux, Caen, and Rouen.[57] In 1157 there appears with him at Rouen Rotrou, bishop of Evreux,[58] who is active in the administration of justice throughout the duchy during the next seven years.[59] At times Rotrou is accompanied by Regi-

Robertum et abbatem et monachos fuerunt testes Godart de Vaus et Robertus de sancta Honorina qui erant in loco episcopi Luxoviarum et Willelmus filius Iohannis et Aitart Polcin qui erant baillivi regis et Robertus abbas Fontaneti et Ricardus filius comitis Gloecestrie et Iordanus Taisson et Rualen de Sal et Iohannes de Guavrei et Willelmus de Vilers et Gaufredus filius Mabile et Robertus filius Bernardi et Rannulfus Rufellus et Nicholaus de Veieves et Robertus de Chernellia et multi alii." Cartulary of Savigny, in Archives of the Manche, no. 219. "Ernulfus Dei gratia Luxoviensis episcopus et R. de Novoburgo Willelmo filio Iohannis salutem. Mandamus tibi atque precipimus ut facias amicos Roberti de Thaun quos abbas Savigneii tibi nominaverit facere fiduciam eidem abbati et monachis ipsius quam ipse Robertus fecit Cadomi coram nobis, et ut facias fratres Roberti forisbanniri in communi foro Cadomi et Baiocis sicut forisfactos regis." *Ibid.*, no. 273.

[57] *Livre Noir*, nos. 27, 28, 35; Valin, p. 267 f.; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198; Deville, *Analyse*, pp. 18, 42; cartulary of Préaux, nos. 78, 82. He is still "dapifer et iusticia totius Normannie" when he retires to Bec in 1159, Robert of Torigni, I. 322, II. 174. *Cf.* Delisle, pp. 445–447; Harcourt, p. 46 f.

[58] "In presencia domini Rotroldi episcopi Ebroicensis et Roberti de Novo Burgo dapiferi et Gualeranni comitis de Mellent et Rogerii abbatis Sancti Wandregisili et Rogerii abbatis Sancti Audoeni Rothomagensis et Hugonis de Gornaio et Godardi de Vallibus et Adam de Wacnevilla et Roberti filii Haimerici apud Rothomagum. Huius pactionis sunt testes". Cartulary of St. Wandrille, D. ii. 14. The first set of witnesses is different in the other version which follows in the cartulary and is printed by Lot, *Études Critiques sur l'Abbaye de S. Wandrille*, no. 88; Round, no. 172.

[59] Delisle, p. 455 f.; Valin, pp. 268, 270; *infra*, note 93. A document of Rotrou for Foucarmont (originals in Archives of the Seine-Inférieure; also in MS. Rouen 1224, f. 87) ends: "Hoc autem totum factum est me presente et audiente et tunc temporis existente iusticia Normannie." The following, for Conches, is more explicit: "Rotrodus Dei gratia Ebroisensis episcopus universis sancte matris ecclesie filiis salutem. Notificamus vobis quod Gilbertus Sancti Petri Castellionensis abbas stramen grangie de Warengevilla et palleas cum revaneis iudicio curie domini regis obtinuit contra Mathilde[m] de Monasteris et contra Matheum filium eius disracionavit, quoniam monachos prefate ecclesie inde multum diu placitis et altercationibus indiscussis vexaverant. Hoc autem iudicium factum est apud Rothomagum in monasterio sancti Gervacii me presente Reinnoldo de sancto Walerico iusticia in curia existente plenissima plurimorum virorum qui huius rei testes fuerunt: Arnulphus Luxoviensis episcopus, Frogerius Sagiensis episcopus, Henricus abbas Fiscannensis, Hugo de Gurnaio, Godardus de Vallibus, Robertus de Freschenes, Adam de Martinevilla, Goselinus Rossel, Robertus Harenc de Waldevilla, Rogerius Mahiel, et alii multi." Cartulary in Archives of the Eure, H. 262, f. 101 v.; filled out from Delisle's copy from a MS. relating to the family of Chambray. Still another example is in the cartulary of Préaux (no. 18): "Notum sit tam presentibus quam futuris quoniam cum ego R. episcopus Ebroicensis et Ricardus de Hummeto constabularius regis essemus iusticiarii regis, Galfredus de Bruecourt et Gislebertus de Bruencourt et Robertus filius Matildis in presentia nostra in plena assisia apud Rothomagum clamaverunt quietam imperpetuum presentationem ecclesie de Bruencourt Michaeli

nald of St. Valéry as justiciar,[60] and in 1163 they hold an itinerary throughout the duchy to ascertain the respective rights of king and barons.[61] Richard de Hommet the constable also appears with this title,[62] and the Bishop of Bayeux may also have held it.[63]

These courts were doubtless attended by the chief barons and royal officers of the region,[64] some of whom evidently acted as judges, although the title of justice appears rarely in the notices of decisions and in most instances it is impossible to distinguish the officials from the barons. A good example is furnished by an assize held at Bayeux by the Bishop of Evreux and Reginald of St. Valéry between 1161 and 1165, where we find the bishops of Lisieux and Avranches, Richard son of the Earl of Gloucester, Godard de Vaux, one of the king's justices,[65] Étard Poulain, one of his *baillis* in the Bessin,[66] Osbert de la Heuse, constable of Cherbourg,[67] Robert Fitz Bernard, *prévôt* of Caen,[68] Graverend d'Evrecy, *vicomte*,[69] Richard de Vaux, *vidame* of the Bishop of Bayeux,[70] and Roger d'Arri, canon of Bayeux and later a permanent official of the Exchequer.[71] The

abbati et ecclesie Pratellensi de qua diu controversia inter eos fuerat. Testibus Hugo [*sic*] de Gornaio et Matheo de Gerardivilla et Nicholaus [*sic*] de Stutevilla et G. de Vallibus et Roberto de Passi et Gisleberto de Vascoil et Roberto de Iuveneio."

60 Delisle, p. 455; Valin, p. 270; Round, nos. 133, 134, 491; Harcourt, p. 48 f.; and the charters printed in the previous note and in note 79 below. Reginald was absent in the East from 1158 to 1160, Robert of Torigni, I. 316, II. 166.

61 "Rotrocus episcopus Ebroicensis et Rainaldus de sancto Walerio fecerunt in Normannia recognoscere iussu regis, per episcopatus, legales redditus et consuetudines ad regem et ad barones pertinentes", Robert of Torigni, I. 344.

62 A judgment of 1164 is rendered "apud Cadomum [coram] abbate de Troarno, Ricardo de Humet tunc temporis iustitia regis, Guillelmo filio Iohannis, Renaldo de Gerponville, Godardo de Vaux, Guillelmo de Varaville, Iordane Taxone, Ricardo filio comitis, Guillelmo Crasso, Henrico de Agnis, Nicholao de Veies, Graver[endo] de Vrecie, Roberto filio Bernardi, Symone de Scuris, Henrico filio Corbini, Roberto Pigache, Guillelmo Forti, Philippo fratre Vitalis monachi, Guillelmo Gernon, Rogero Darried, Ricardo de Vaux, Iohanne Cumin" Cartulary of S. Wandrille, Q. ii. 36. See also *supra*, note 59.

63 He is specially mentioned with Robert de Neufbourg in Round, no. 132, and with Rotrou in Valin, p. 268. *Cf.* Harcourt, p. 47, note.

64 "Interfuerunt huic concordie comes de Mellent, comes Ebroicensis, comes Giffardus, et multi barones et servientes regis de diversis partibus." Charter of Rotrou, Delisle, p. 455.

65 Valin, p. 270; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 197. *Cf.* the longer list in the assize at Caen in 1164, *supra*, note 62.

66 *Infra*, notes 77–79.

67 Delisle, p. 409.

68 Robert of Torigni, II. 251.

69 *Ibid.*, II. 248.

70 *Ibid.*, II. 258.

71 See lists of Exchequer cases and of assizes in part II. of this article to be published in the January number of this journal.

vicomtes and *baillis* acted as judges in their own districts,[72] where an ordinance of 1159 required them to hold court once a month,[73] and they naturally sat with the justiciars in the larger assizes, where they are sometimes specifically called justices. Thus William Fitz John and Étard Poulain, the chief royal officers in the Bessin,[74] both with the title of *baillivi regis*,[75] are constantly found in the assizes of Lower Normandy. William can be traced in the local administration of justice as well as in the assizes, and later in the reign becomes *dapifer*, justice, and *procurator Normannie*.[76] Étard sits in two cases at Caen in 1157, in one of them apparently with the title of justiciar,[77] and is *iusticia regis* at Lisieux in 1161[78] and at Rouen in the same period.[79] He is frequently accompanied by Godard de Vaux, who replaces the Bishop of Lisieux at Caen at the beginning of the reign, sits at Caen and Rouen in 1157,[80] and appears at various other sessions at Rouen in this period, often with a certain Adam de Warneville, who may also have been a justice.[81] Our

[72] Thus at Pontaudemer and in the territory of Brionne, William de Morville is "custos et iusticia iussu regis Henrici", cartulary of Pontaudemer (MS. Rouen 1252), ff. 18, 28; Delisle, no. 240. At Mortain in 1162–1163 we find the constable, Robert Boquerel (*Analecta Bollandiana*, II. 527), holding the king's court (Delisle, p. 440; original in MS. Rouen 3122, no. 4); and somewhat later the seneschal of Mortain, Nigel, addressed as one of the king's justices (Stapleton, I. lxv; Delisle, pp. 210, 408).

[73] Robert of Torigni, II. 180.

[74] Delisle, pp. 366, 479 f.; Tardif, I. 110; *Livre Noir*, nos. 9, 12.

[75] Delisle, p. 446; *supra*, note 56.

[76] *Livre Noir*, nos. 27, 28, 35, 36, 46; Robert of Torigni, II. 31, 251 f.; Round, no. 516; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198; *supra*, notes 56, 62.

[77] Robert of Torigni, II. 252; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 197.

[78] *Infra*, note 105.

[79] "Gaufridus Rothomagensis ecclesie decanus et tocius eiusdem ecclesie conventus presentibus et futuris salutem. [Not]um esse volumus sancte mātris ecclesie filiis quod m[olendinu]m nostrum de Marrona concedimus domui infirmorum de Rothomago [in ec]clesia Sancti Iacobi tenendum in perpetuum sicut tenuerunt iure hereditario Macharius et heredes eius a quibus ipsum emerunt pro .xv. marcis argenti, salvo ibi censu nostro scilicet tribus solidis usualis monete singulis annis in festo Sancti Remigii reddendis. Hec autem em[ptio publice] celebrata est in presentia nostra cui interfuerunt etiam [iustitie regis] Rainaldus de Sancto Walerico, Godardus de Vallibus, [Adam de W]annevilla, Willelmus de Malapalude, Radulfus filius Urselini, Ro[celin filius] Clarembaldi, Rainaldus de Sancto Philiberto." Original, injured but with missing portions supplied in modern copy, in Archives Nationales, S. 4899, no. 6. Delisle by a slip attributes this document to Geoffrey's successor Robert and thus places it after 1175, the date of Geoffrey's death; the error vitiates several of his biographical notes (pp. 100, 377, 417, 422, 449, 491). William de Malpalu also appears as justice in Delisle, p. 490; and in a document of Richard Talbot for Mont-aux-Malades (Archives of the Seine-Inférieure), where an agreement is sworn to "coram Willelmo de Mala Palude tunc regis iusticiario".

[80] *Supra*, notes 56, 58.

[81] *Supra*, notes 58, 59; *infra*, note 93; Delisle, p. 456; cartulary of Préaux, nos. 78, 82; also, perhaps, as justice, in an illegible charter in the Archives of the Manche, H. 212.

information does not permit us to separate the local from the itinerant judges in the records of the assizes, still less to follow the work of the local courts. Doubtless arrangements varied locally and in the course of the reign, and apparently the confusion of local areas stood in the way of a system of courts as simple and uniform as the English. The one clear point of special importance is the existence of a well-defined institution of itinerant justices.

Of even greater interest is the question of procedure, which bears directly upon the development of the jury. In England, in spite of the occasional employment of the sworn inquest since the Conqueror's time, we have no evidence that it was a normal mode of trial before the appearance of the assize *utrum* in 1164, followed shortly by the other possessory assizes and the grand assize. In Normandy, on the other hand, writs ordering the determination of questions of possession and ownership in accordance with the duke's assize (*secundum assisiam meam*) are found in the early part of Geoffrey's reign and again in 1156,[82] and it has been argued that these point to the establishment of the recognition as a regular method of trial throughout the duchy by a formal enactment or assize in this period.[83] Unfortunately we find the phrase in these early years only in documents in favor of the see of Bayeux, and while the bishop clearly had the right of having any dispute between him and his tenants determined in this way, it is not clear that the privilege had thus early become general. Early in Henry's reign (1156–1159), however, we have a striking piece of evidence regarding its wider use. In the course of a series of inquests held in different parts of Normandy for the benefit of St. Stephen's of Caen we read that it was recognized at Rouen that "the monks should hold quit their meadows of Bapeaume, with respect to which William, son of Thétion de Fonte, who claimed the right to them, failed as regards the title and the decision of right before Robert and the barons of Normandy in the king's *curia* and as regards the assize which he had demanded with respect to them".[84] The ac-

[82] *Livre Noir,* nos. 24, 25, 27.

[83] Brunner, *Entstehung der Schwurgerichte,* pp. 301–304; Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie,* pp. 208–210, both of whom wrongly attribute nos. 24 and 25 to Henry as duke instead of to Geoffrey. I have discussed the Bayeux evidence in the American Historical Review, VIII. 613–640 (1903). The discovery of the word assize in the recognition for St. Stephen's in the Cartulaire de Normandie has since led me to give more weight to the possibility of a general assize under Geoffrey than I was then inclined to admit.

[84] "Et recognitum fuit quod predictis monachis remanserunt sua prata de Abapalmis quieta unde Willelmus filius Thetionis de Fonte, qui in illis clamabat ius, defecit se de iure et de consideratione recti coram Roberto et coram baronibus Normannie in curia regis et de assisia quam inde requisierat." Charter of

count is brief, all too brief, for we have only the summary of the case in a royal charter of confirmation, but two points stand out clearly: the question at issue was that of right to the land (*ius*), and not mere possession;[85] and the party which demanded the assize in the king's court was the lay claimant, not the monastery, as in the other recognitions for St. Stephen's. The assize in this instance, therefore, cannot be a special privilege enjoyed by an ecclesiastical establishment, since it is demanded against the monks, nor could such a claimant have put himself upon the assize unless this was a regular method of trial, such as the term comes to denote in England. All this, be it noted, cannot be later than 1159, when Robert de Neufbourg retired from his judicial functions, and thus antedates considerably the first mention of such assizes in England.[86] In this same year, at his Christmas court at Falaise,[87] Henry decreed that the testimony of the vicinage should be required in support of charges brought by rural deans, and that his own officers, in the monthly decisions of the local courts, should "pronounce no judgments without the evidence of neighbors". The exact meaning of this comprehensive language does not appear from our only source of information, the Bec annalist, but it seems not only to require such use of the accusing jury in ecclesiastical courts as is prescribed in the Constitutions of Clarendon,[88] but also to give it wider scope in the ducal courts, very likely by extending it to criminal accusations before the duke's local judges. Already the itinerant justices are having outlaws proclaimed in the marketplaces,[89] and felons are soon fleeing the realm for their crimes.[90] If we could accept the evidence of a charter of Henry for St. Evroul, apparently given between 1159 and 1163,[91] the existence of a form of recognition cor-

Henry II. in Cartulaire de Normandie (MS. Rouen 1235), f. 21 v., printed in Valin, p. 268, where it is loosely dated; Delisle, no. 110. No. 74 in Delisle probably covers the same decisions.

85 I cannot follow Valin, p. 213, in interpreting the suit as one concerning possession.

86 The assizes cited by Bigelow, *History of Procedure*, p. 124, from the early Pipe Rolls denote evidently the *assisa comitatus*. Not till 1166 do these rolls use the term in the sense of royal legislation.

87 Robert of Torigni, II. 180. *Cf.* Pollock and Maitland, I. 151. Stubbs says (Benedictus, II. lix): "This looks very like an instruction to the county court."

88 C. 6.

89 *Supra*, note 56. On the importance of the *fora patrie* in such cases see the *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 36, 37; and *cf.* Wace, *Roman du Rou* (ed. Andresen), vol. II., l. 334; and Arnulf of Lisieux, *Epistolae*, no. 110.

90 Round, no. 133.

91 Printed by me, from an incorrect copy from the cartulary of St. Evroul, no. 24, in the American Historical Review, VIII. 634. Also in the Registres du Trésor des Chartes, JJ. 69, no. 194; Round, no. 641; Delisle, no. 141.

responding to the assize *utrum* would be established for Normandy in this period. This document, however, which is suspicious in form,[92] does not correspond to the report of the case by the justiciar Rotrou,[93] and I believe it to contain a somewhat modernized version of the transaction, prepared in the later years of the twelfth century. Rotrou's charter says nothing of the question of lay fee or alms, but adjudges to the monks, after sworn inquest, full right to the presentation, tithes, and lands belonging to the church in question.

[92] The charter combines the king's style of the latter half of the reign with a witness who cannot be later than 1163, and contains the suspicious phrase *teste me ipso,* which appears in two other fabrications of this period from St. Evroul (Delisle, nos. 347, 362; see pp. 226, 316 f.) and has not yet been found in an original charter of this reign (Delisle, p. 226, where he makes too much of the occurrence of the phrase in charters for different monasteries, since copyists or forgers might easily carry back a formula common in the succeeding reign). The language of the document is also unusual, quite unlike that of Rotrou's charter, which speaks of but five knights and reports the determination of more limited questions of title. As Henry's charter is also found in a *vidimus* of Mathilda, daughter of the monastery's adversary in the suit (cartulary of St. Evroul, no. 426; Collection Lenoir, at Semilly, LXXII. 17, LXXIII. 467), its fabrication or modification cannot be placed more than a generation later.

[93] "Rotrodus Dei gratia Rothomagensis archiepiscopus omnibus ad quos presens scriptum pervenerit et precipue ballivis domini regis salutem. Sciatis quod ex precepto domini regis quando per eum per totam Normanniam iusticiam secularem exercebamus, miseratione divina tunc temporis Ebroicensem episcopatum regentes, in plena assisia apud Rothomagum die festo sancte Cecilie Garinus de Grandivalle et Ricardus Faiel et Rogerus de Moenaio et Rogerus Goulafre et Robertus Chevalier iuraverunt quod ecclesia sancti Ebrulfi et abbas et monachi eius anno et die quo H. rex filius Willelmi regis fuit vivus et mortuus et postea usque modo presentationem beati Petri de Sap pacifice et quiete habuit in elemosinam cum omnibus decimis et aliis pertinenciis suis et masnagium Willelmi filii Hugonis cum omnibus pertinenciis suis tam in terris quam in aliis rebus possedit. Ipsi vero milites se fecerunt ignorantes utrum cultura que Ardeneta noncupatur ad ius sancti Ebrulfi vel ad ius domini de Sap verius pertineret, et tamen quandam acram terre in eadem cultura per ecclesiam sancti Ebrulfi cultam fuisse per sacramentum se vidisse testati sunt. Post obitum vero predicti H. regis residuum predicte culture per abbatem sancti Ebrulfi cultum fuisse prefati milites necnon et totam illam culturam ad abbatiam sancti Ebrulfi pocius quam ad dominum de Sappo secundum oppinionem suam pertinere iuraverunt. Nos autem domini regis adimplentes mandatum de consilio baronum ipsius qui presentes erant presentationem predicte ecclesie cum decimis et aliis pertinenciis suis necnon et masnagium iam dictum cum cultura de Ardeneta et aliis omnibus, que sicut dictum est secundum formam regii mandati abbati et monachis eius recognita fuerunt, eisdem de cetero in pace et quiete habenda et possidenda, licet nunquam amisissent, adiudicavimus.

"Testibus Arnulfo Lexoviensi episcopo, H[enrico] abbati Fiscannensi, Victore abbate sancti Georgii de Bauchervilla, Galeranno comite Mellenti, comite Patricio, camerario de Tancarvilla, Hugone de Gornaco, Roberto filio Geroii, Nicholao de Stotevilla, Godardo de Vallibus, Roberto filio Hamerici, Roberto de Varvic, Raginaldo de Ierponvilla, Ricardo Beverel, Adam de Walnevilla." MS. Lat. 11055, no. 172.

Besides these traces of legislation, we find in the early years of Henry's reign, numerous instances of recognitions held to ascertain the rights of the duke[94] and the feudal and domanial possessions of churches and monasteries,[95] as well as examples of sworn inquests in bishops' and barons' courts[96] and by voluntary agreement between claimants;[97] but these, while affording further illustration of the prevalence of this mode of trial, are not in themselves sufficient to show that it has become the normal form of procedure. Only when we get away from the inquest which is primarily fiscal, whether for the benefit of the king or of some privileged church, and find the recognition regularly resorted to by ordinary litigants in particular categories of cases, can we be sure that we have something which corresponds to the later English assizes. Such evidence is afforded by the suit of William Fitz Thétion against St. Stephen's to determine the right to the meadows near Rouen, and by a case in the king's court at Gavray in 1159 in which Osmund Vasce proved his right to the presentation of Mesnil-Drey and two sheaves of its tithe.[98] These cases presuppose the recognition as the method of deciding such suits, and when considered in connection with the enactments at Falaise respecting the accusing jury, they seem to imply some specific act of legislation on the part of the duke, like the "constitutio regni que assisa nominatur" of Glanvill.[99] Such legislation may well have begun with general privileges for particular religious establishments, such as Geoffrey issued for the Bishop of Bayeux, but by 1159 it had gone so far as to set up the recognition in the local courts and had apparently made it the normal procedure in certain types of actions concerning land. That matters had then reached this point on the English side of the Channel has not up to the present been shown, and in the existing state of our knowledge it is highly probable that Henry drew upon the results of his Norman experience in

94 *Livre Noir,* nos. 13, 35, 138; Robert of Torigni, I. 344; Musée de la Bénédictine de Fécamp, no. 16 (Round, no. 134; Delisle, no. 145); *supra,* notes 19–22.

95 Valin, pp. 267–270; *Mémoires des Antiquaires,* XV. 197–198; Robert of Torigni, II. 241, 251.

96 American Historical Review, VIII. 636–638; Valin, p. 264; charter of Fulc, dean of Lisieux, in 1148, Archives of the Calvados, fonds of Ste. Barbe; charter of Philip, bishop of Bayeux, in MS. Lat. 11055, no. 233; cartulary of Préaux, no. 93; charter of John, count of Eu, in cartulary of Foucarmont, f. 48 v., and two charters of Archbishop Hugh for Fécamp in the Archives of the Seine-Inférieure.

97 American Historical Review, VIII. 636. Somewhat later examples will be found in the Great Cartulary of Jumièges, no. 212; cartulary of Fécamp (MS. Rouen, 1207), f. 36 v.; *Livre Blanc* of St. Martin of Séez, no. 269.

98 Robert of Torigni, II. 259; see *infra,* note 103.

99 XIII., c. I.

drafting his English assizes. There was, of course, no mechanical transfer, for a restless experimenter like Henry was constantly reshaping his materials, and if we could follow the process in Normandy, we should probably find him modifying in various ways the procedure and the assize which he had inherited from his father. Something, too, must be allowed for the natural development of the institution as it passed into more general use, but the exceptional is not likely to have become normal without some direct action of the sovereign in extending his prerogative procedure to his subjects, and in this respect the evidence available from the years before 1164 places Normandy in advance of England.

There is another field in which the practice of the Norman courts before 1164 has a special interest for England, namely that of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The struggle between Henry II. and Becket, says Maitland, has a long Frankish prologue; has it also a Norman prologue? A short prologue, at least, it must have had, for in February, 1162, a great council was held at Rouen, in which Henry "complained of the bishops and their officers and his *vicomtes* and ordered that the provisions of the Council of Lillebonne should be observed".[100] No details are given, but the mention of the local officers and the Council of Lillebonne shows plainly that the question was one of encroachments by the Church which his officers failed to prevent. Just which of the canons of this council the king believed to have been violated we can only surmise, but he clearly sought to base his protest, as in England two years later, upon an appeal to ancient and well-established practice, as contained in a document which had been drawn up under the Conqueror in 1080 and confirmed by Henry I.,[101] and which thus presented a more definite formulation of the "customs, liberties, and dignities of his ancestors" than was at hand in England. From the ecclesiastical point of view, these canons had become somewhat antiquated by 1162, since they appealed constantly to local Norman usage rather than to

[100] "Querimoniam faciens de episcopis et eorum ministris et vicecomitibus suis, iussit ut concilium Iulie Bone teneretur." Robert of Torigni, I. 336.

[101] The best text of the Council of Lillebonne, now preserved in the Archives Nationales, bears the seal of Henry I. Teulet, *Layettes*, I. 25, no. 22; Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 1. The canons are also given by Ordericus, II. 316–323; *cf.* the analysis given by Tardif, *Étude sur les Sources*, pp. 39–43. Evidence that they were observed in the twelfth century is found in a charter of Audoin, bishop of Evreux from 1118 to 1139: "Convocatis ex more ad synodum omnibus presbiteris nostris, circadam quam ab illis exigebam ex concilii Iulibone institutione et ecclesiarum episcopalium Normannie consuetudine, quoniam illa gravari conquerebantur, eorum communi petitione et nostrorum canonicorum intercessione perdonavi." Archives of the Eure, G. 122, no. 36. The canons of the council were frequently copied in legal collections relating to Normandy.

the general principles of canon law which had been more sharply formulated in the interval, and since they recognized the supremacy of the duke and the arbitrament of his *curia* in church matters to an extent which would not have been admitted by the Church in Henry's time. It is, indeed, highly probable that Henry's complaint was based particularly upon the closing enactment of the assembly of Lillebonne, that the bishops should seize no right of justice or customary dues beyond those there enumerated until they had established their claim in the king's court; but the absence of evidence precludes us from examining the bearing of this canon upon the vexed question of criminous clerks. The ordinance of 1159 to which reference has already been made[102] indicates that Henry's dissatisfaction with the exercise of jurisdiction by archdeacons and deans had found expression in Normandy as well as in England before the great struggle with Becket. Still another claim which Henry made in 1164 we are able to test by Norman practice, namely, the jurisdiction of the king's court over suits respecting advowson and presentation. That such questions were decided in the duke's court is clear from documents concerning Mont St. Michel and St. Evroul,[103] one of which deals with a dispute between laymen, the other between a layman and a monastery; but we also find the bishop exercising jurisdiction in such cases when one or both of the parties were ecclesiastics,[104] and it is not clear where the line was at this time drawn, if it was as yet clearly drawn, between the two jurisdictions.[105] Along with the question of presentation went often that of the tithe and the lands pertaining to the Church, and while we find traces of the bishop's jurisdiction here also,[106] we know that these questions were repeatedly tried in

102 Robert of Torigni, II. 180; *supra*, p. 37.

103 Robert of Torigni, II. 259; *supra*, note 93.

104 Robert of Torigni, II. 259; dispute between Archbishop Hugh and the Abbot of Préaux, cartulary of Préaux, no. 51; Jourdain Taisson *v.* a clerk in the court of Henry, bishop of Bayeux, Archives of the Calvados, H. 5606, 3.

105 Both jurisdictions might, apparently without rivalry, deal with the same case. Thus (1156–1159) we find the Prior of Perrières establishing his right to the tithe of Epanney in the courts of the Bishop of Séez (Collection Moreau, LXVIII. 9), the Archbishop of Rouen (Archives of the Orne, H. 2026), and the king, the judgment being finally confirmed by Henry: "teneat bene et in pace et quiete totam decimam suam de Espanaio sicut eam dirationavit in curia mea coram iusticiis meis et in curia archiepiscopi Rothomagensis" (Collection Moreau, LXVII. 150). We also find the king's justices sitting in the court of the Bishop of Lisieux in 1161 in a case between Alice Trubaud and the Abbot of Caen against the Abbot of Troarn: "Huius autem actionis sunt testes et ipsius iudicii cooperatores extiterunt Normannus et Iohannes archidiaconi, Fulco decanus, Rogerius filius Aini canonicus et alii plures canonici Lexovienses sed et barones regis Radulfus de Torneio, Robertus de Montfort, Aicardus Pulcin iusticia regis"; cartulary of Troarn (MS. Lat. 10086), f. 159; *cf.* Arnulf's charter, f. 152 v.

106 *E. g., Neustria Pia*, p. 351; cartulary of St. Evroul (MS. Lat. 11055), no. 233.

the duke's court by recognition,[107] which seems to have taken the form, not of the preliminary assize *utrum,* but of the ultimate adjudication of the lands to the claimant.[108] Here, as in all questions concerning the Norman antecedents of the Constitutions of Clarendon, the evidence is interesting but too scanty to be conclusive.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

[107] *Supra,* notes 93, 98; Delisle, no. 268; Stapleton, l. 5, 12, 43, 55, 64, 96; Archives of the Manche, H. 6452; Archives of the Calvados, H. suppl. 486, f. 9.

[108] Brunner, *Schwurgerichte,* pp. 324–326; Maitland, *Collected Papers,* II. 216, who argues from the *Coutumier* that the Norman assize was merely preliminary.

COLONIAL COMMERCE[1]

As a rule trade and commerce in their various manifestations, as features of American colonial history, have been considered of minor importance by our historians and relegated to the obscurity of a few supplemental paragraphs. No writer has placed them in the same rank with government, administration, and social development, or has deemed their consideration essential to a proper understanding of the conditions under which our colonies were founded and grew up. Yet it is a well-recognized fact that during the greater part of our colonial period commerce and the colonies were correlative terms, unthinkable each without the other. As an underlying factor in colonial life commerce was of greater significance than it is to-day in the life of the United States, for some of the most vital aspects of our early history can be understood only when construed in terms of commercial relationship, either with England or with some of the other maritime powers of the period which were finding their strength and prosperity in colonial and commercial expansion.

In the domain of history a shift in the angle of observation will often bring into view new and important vistas and will create such new impressions of old scenes as to alter our ideas of the whole landscape. In the case of colonial history this statement is peculiarly true. Viewing the colonies as isolated units of government and life, detached in the main from the larger world of England and the Continent, leads us to ignore those connections that constituted the colonial relationship in which commerce played a most important rôle. The older view is natural because it is easily taken and satisfies local interest and pride; the newer point of observation is more remote, less obvious, and more difficult of attainment. Yet it is the only view that enables us to preserve the integrity of our subject and so to comprehend the meaning of our history. The thirteen colonies were not isolated units; they were dependencies of the British crown and parts of a colonial empire extending from America to India. They were not a detached group of communities; on the contrary they were a group among other groups of settlements and plantations belonging colonially to five of the European nations, Portugal, Spain, Holland, France, and England, and their history was influenced at

[1] A paper read in the conference on colonial commerce at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Charleston, December 30, 1913.

every point by the policies and rivalries of these maritime powers. The age in which they reached their maximum of strength as colonies was one in which the colonial relationship was highly developed and the feature of subordination to a higher authority an integral and dominant characteristic. Such an interpretation of colonial history is not a scholar's vagary, a matter of theory and hypothesis to be accepted or rejected as the writer on colonial history may please. It is historically sound, preserving the proper perspective, and preventing in no way the following out to the uttermost detail the local activities and interests of the colonists themselves.

The reason why this colonial relationship has been so persistently ignored in the past is not difficult to discover. The period of our history before 1783 has been construed as merely the ante-chamber to the great hall of our national development. In so doing writers have concerned themselves not with colonial history as such, but rather with the colonial antecedents of our national history. This form of treatment is common to all our histories, even the very best, because all limit their scope to the thirteen colonies, which formed but part of the colonial area and are segregated for no other reason than that they constituted the portion out of which the United States of America grew. In our text-books, not excepting the very latest, the colonial period is frankly presented as an era of beginnings, and stress is laid upon ideas and institutions that were destined to become dominant features of the nation's later career. With this mode of presenting the subject we may not quarrel, but it seems almost a pity, now that we are becoming such a nation of text-book writers, that the children of the country cannot be set upon the right way of understanding what the colonial period really means. Dealing with thirteen colonies, searching among them for the conditions under which were laid the foundations of the great republic, and treating those conditions as but preliminary to the history of the United States will never enable the writer to present an honest or complete picture of colonial life or to analyze successfully the causes that provoked revolution or rendered independence inevitable.

In one respect the colonial period is fundamentally different from that of our national history. For one hundred and seventy-five years, the people who inhabited the American seaboard were not members of an independent and sovereign state, free of all control except such as they exercised for themselves. Legally, they formed dependent and subordinate communities, subject to a will and authority higher than themselves and outside of themselves. This state of dependency was a reality and not a pretense. At least, the members

of the British Parliament deemed it so, when in 1733 they rejected a petition from the assembly of Massachusetts as "frivolous and groundless, an high insult upon his Majesty's government, and tending to shake off the dependency of the said colony upon this kingdom, to which by law and right they are and ought to be subject". At least the British executive and administrative authorities deemed it so, when by a thousand acts and through hundreds of officials in the colonies they endeavored to maintain the royal prerogative and to carry out the British policy of making English subjects the sole carriers of the whole British commerce and of appropriating and securing to England and her subjects "all the emoluments arising from the trade of her own colonies". The British merchants took this view, when they could say, as Stephen Godin asserted in 1724, that "it were better to have no colonies at all unless they be subservient to their mother country". Certainly the colonists deemed it so, when by their very restlessness under restraint they betrayed the reality of the ties that bound them. No act of the colonists, either individual or collective, can be traced to a conscious expectation of future citizenship in an independent republic. No aspect of colonial resistance to the royal authority was ever due to any definite belief that an independent nation was in the making. There is nothing to show that a colonist ever allowed visions of such a future to influence the course of his daily life. To the colonist there was no United States of America in anticipation, and there should be none to the student of colonial history to-day. The subject should be dealt with for its own sake and not for its manifestations of self-government and democracy; and the eye of the scholar should look no further ahead than to its legitimate end, the close of a period, the era of revolution, war, and independence.

It may be stated as a general principle that studying a period of history with its later manifestations before us is apt to lead to perversions of historical truth. With notions of the present in mind we approach certain landmarks of our early history in much the same spirit as that in which older writers approached Magna Carta. Most of us make too few allowances for the differences of mental longitude between the present and the past, and fail to realize that our thoughts were not the thoughts of our forefathers and our institutions were not the institutions they set up. The colonial period is our Middle Ages, and he would be rash who interpreted the thoughts of that time in the light of later views as to what democracy ought to be. There are traces and important traces of radical notions in matters of government in our colonial period, for our colonies were settled during a century of unrest in religion and politics; but these notions were not

the characteristic or the generally prevalent ideas that governed colonial action. It is not profitable or scholarly to single out these manifestations, to study them apart from their surroundings, and to classify them as representative and typical of the period in which they appeared. I am afraid that the majority of the colonists listening to some modern comments upon the early institutions of New England and Virginia, would have replied in somewhat the same fashion as Maitland pictures William Lyndwood replying to questions on the "canon law of Rome":

> I do not quite understand what you mean by popular liberties and this thing that you call democracy. I am an Englishman and I know the liberties that I enjoyed in England. But these were class liberties, to be understood in the light of the law and of the rights of the crown and parliament; they are not what you mean when you talk about popular rights and liberties in a democratic republic. You mean equal liberties for all, including the mass of the people. But that is something we do not want, for that would admit all men of whatever station, property, or faith to equal privileges in society, church, and state, and such a philosophy of government is one in which only a dreamer would believe.

In truth, we have arrived at this idea of what our forefathers thought, by selecting certain documents and incidents, from the Mayflower Compact to the Declaration of Independence, and from Bacon's Rebellion to the various riotous acts of the pre-Revolutionary period; and, construing them more or less according to our wishes and prepossessions, have wrought therefrom an epic of patriotism satisfying to our self-esteem. We love to praise those who struggled, sometimes with high purposes, sometimes under the influence of purely selfish motives, against the authority of the British crown. But this, in an historical sense, is pure pragmatism. It is not history, because it treats only a part of the subject and treats it wrongly and with a manifest bias. It does not deal with what may be called the normal conditions of the colonial period. It ignores the prevailing sentiment of those who, however often they may have objected to the way in which the royal authority was exercised and to the men who exercised it, lived contented lives, satisfied in the main with the conditions surrounding them, and believing firmly in the system of government under which they had been born and brought up. It misunderstands and consequently exaggerates expressions of radical sentiment, and interprets such terms as "freedom", "liberty", and "independence" as if, in the mouths of those who used them, they had but a single meaning and that meaning the one commonly prevalent at the present time. It relegates to a place of secondary importance the royal prerogative and the relation with England,

which beyond all other factors dominated the lives and actions of a majority of the colonists. Without an understanding of the relationship with England, colonial history can have no meaning. Before we can treat of colonial self-government, of the growth of democratic ideas, of the conflict between the colonies and the mother-country, and of the westward movement, we must know what England was doing, according to what principles she acted, and how these principles found application in the colonial world that stretched from Hudson Bay to Barbadoes. Only in this way can we deal with our own colonial problems, and only in this way can we answer those subordinate but important questions, why did not the West Indies and the Floridas revolt, and why did the Canadian colonies remain loyal to the mother-country.

This preliminary statement is necessary in order to explain the attitude that I shall take in regard to the subject under consideration here. One period of our history, that from 1690 to 1750, has long been recognized as a neglected period, and it will continue to be neglected as long as we treat colonial history merely as a time of incubation. Now just as an important period has suffered neglect from failure to make a radical change in our point of view, so an important phase of colonial history has suffered similar neglect from a similar cause. I refer to the subject of colonial commerce. The many divisions of this fundamentally important topic have lain hitherto strewn about over the pages of colonial history, veritable *disjecta membra,* without proper unity and co-ordination, and without that grouping of principal, subordinate, incidental, and extraordinary features, which taken together disclose the paramount significance of the whole.

Any study of colonial commerce should begin with a thorough grounding in the commercial policy of England from the beginning of the colonial period, and a thorough understanding of the place of the colonies, not only in England's commercial scheme, but also in the schemes of other maritime states of the European world. England's relations with the colonies were primarily commercial in character, not only because of the wide expanse of water that separated the mother-country from her outlying possessions, but much more because from the beginning to the end of the legal connection, England's interest in the colonies was a commercial interest. British merchants and statesmen valued the colonies just as far as they contributed to the commercial and industrial prosperity at home; and they actively promoted and upheld legislation that brought the colonies within the bonds of the commercial empire. Commerce was, therefore, the cornerstone of the British system. Naturally other

interests, legal, political, institutional, religious, and military, assumed large proportions as the British colonial system was gradually worked out: but in the ultimate analysis it will be found that the building up of strong, self-governing communities in America and the West Indies was a contributory rather than a primary object, furthering the commercial aims of British merchants and statesmen through the establishment of vigorous but dependent groups of producers and consumers; for England was bound to protect and develop the sources of her wealth and power. England valued her colonies exactly as far as they were of commercial importance to her, and it was no accident that the terms "trade" and "plantations" were joined in the same phrase as the title of the British boards of control, or that in the same title "trade" took precedence over "plantations". The commercial history of every colony, without exception though not all in the same measure, was affected by this policy of the mother-country, who, possessing plenary authority, was able to enforce to no inconsiderable extent the policy that she laid down. A study of colonial commerce carries us at once, therefore, into the very heart of that most fundamental of all colonial questions, the relation of the colonies to the sovereign power across the sea.

If we limit our observation to a single colony or to the group of thirteen colonies, as we are more or less bound to do when dealing with colonial history as prefatory to that of the United States, we get an imperfect view of our subject, if, indeed, that can be called a view at all which is taken at such close range. Commerce thus seen appears to be an interesting, but not particularly conspicuous, feature of colonial life. Settlement, government, politics, religion, war, and social life generally have taken precedence of it in the narratives of our writers. If not ignored or treated as an issue of only local or minor consequence, it is used as a convenient text for moralizing on the unwarranted part which a government can take in interfering with the free and natural development of a high-spirited and liberty-loving people. As a rule such an attitude is due to the unprofitable habit of studying colonial history with our ideas warped and distorted by standards of judgment derived from the Revolutionary and national periods, a habit that is formed when colonial history is studied from the wrong end. Mr. Beer is showing us how to correct that habit, and his volumes are teaching us what can be done when the right vantage-point is sought for and attained. We are now beginning to learn that what we call colonial commerce was but part of that ocean-wide commercial activity of England and her merchants which stands as England's most vital possession of the

last two centuries, and thus was concerned with a larger world of obligations and opportunities than that embraced by the thirteen colonies. Construed in this way, colonial commerce grows in dignity and rank and yields to no other phase of our history in the influence it has exercised upon the life of the period to which it belongs.

In presenting our subject from this standpoint, we must in the first place acquire a sound knowledge of the commercial ideas of the period, of mercantilism and the self-sufficing empire in all aspects of their development, and we must exhibit a sympathetic attitude toward views and opinions that had as legitimate a right to a place in the commercial and political thought of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as have corresponding but different views and opinions a right to exist to-day. We must study understandingly the conditions under which these commercial ideas came into being, and must analyze thoroughly and carefully all orders, proclamations, statutes, and instructions that represent official utterances upon these points; the minutes of subordinate councils and boards; and the letters, pamphlets, and memorials of private persons that contain expressions of individual opinion. Furthermore, we must follow in all their ramifications, in all the colonies dependent on the authority of the British crown, the attempts, whether successful or unsuccessful, to apply these regulations to the actual business of commerce. The Navigation Acts were but the most conspicuous of hundreds of official declarations, defining the limits within which colonial commerce could be carried on; yet even now we understand but imperfectly the influence of those acts upon our colonial history and the extent to which they were obeyed.

In tracing the effect of the Acts of Trade and Navigation, we shall meet with a series of institutions in the colonies that played a continuous and active part in the every-day life of the colonists, and we shall find that as yet scarcely one of these institutions has been made the subject of any comprehensive treatment. The Navigation Acts gave rise to the plantation duty, the collectors and surveyors of customs, and the naval officers, and involved the intricate question of salaries and fees; they brought into existence the courts of vice-admiralty with their complements of officials, their procedure under the civil law, their claims of jurisdiction, and their time-honored antagonism to the courts of common law which had already and everywhere been set up in America. We shall find that the machinery for the control of colonial commerce, thus set in motion, gave added duties, not only to existing departments and boards in England—a subject of no little importance in itself for colonial history—but also to the governors of every colony without exception,

and to the admirals and commanders of ships of war engaged before 1713 (and even after that date on account of West African pirates and Spanish *guardacostas,* in the work of convoying fleets of merchant ships back and forth across the Atlantic); of looking after affairs in Newfoundland, where civil control was vested in an admiral-governor; and of interfering, long before the famous interferences of 1760 to 1765, to prevent illegal trade and the traffic in uncustomed goods. As we follow on in our study of colonial commerce, we meet with the attempts to set up ports of entry in Virginia, Maryland, and elsewhere for the discharge and lading of ships and the checking of illegal trade, and with the complicated problems of embargoes, chiefly in times of war, of the impressment of seamen from colonial vessels in England and from colonial ports in America for the manning of the royal ships, and of the issue of passes, provided by the Admiralty under special treaties between England and the Barbary States, great numbers of which were used in America by American-built ships to guard against capture by the Barbary cruisers, most dangerous of whom were the Algerine pirates. We are concerned with the question of privateering and the issue of letters of marque, and also with that of prizes, the establishment of special prize courts, and the disposition of ships captured in war. We are concerned also with the question of coast defense in America, the employment of frigates and smaller vessels for the guarding of individual colonies, and with the whole subject of piracy, including the efforts made through the navy, the colonial governors, and specially commissioned courts erected for the purpose, to suppress these marauders of the seas. Indirectly, we are concerned with England's attempt to persuade the colonies to produce naval stores for the use of the royal navy, an attempt which played an important part in the industrial history of the continental colonies, especially in New England; and we are also concerned with England's determination to control the supply of masts from the northern American forests, by means of special officials, notably the surveyor-general of the woods and his deputies, whose business was very obnoxious to the northern colonists.

Furthermore, the attempts of the colonists to evade the restrictions that England laid down for the control of navigation and commerce not only resulted in the seizure of scores of ships, their condemnation and sale, and the arousing of a great amount of ill-will and hostility, but they were also responsible, and often directly responsible, for events of political and constitutional importance, such as the loss of the Massachusetts charter, the consolidation of the northern colonies under Andros, the temporary control of Mary-

land and Pennsylvania by the king, and the unsuccessful efforts, lasting nearly half a century, to unite the proprietary and corporate colonies to the crown. These are important events in colonial history and can all be traced immediately or remotely to the demands of England's commercial policy.

Continuing this subject in its further ramifications, we find it leading us on into other aspects of the life of the colonies. Commerce influenced the passing of colonial laws; provoked the king in council to disallow colonial acts, because under the statute of 1696 the colonists were forbidden to have any "Laws, Bye-Laws, Usages or Customs" that were in any way repugnant to the terms of the act, and because the colonial governors were forbidden "to pass any laws by which the Trade or Navigation of the kingdom [might]in any ways be affected";[2] brought about appeals to the High Court of Admiralty from the courts of vice-admiralty in America, and in a few cases at least from the common law courts in the colonies to the

[2] *House of Lords Manuscripts,* new series, II. 483–488, 494–499 (1696–1697); C. O. 5: 1364, pp. 474–476; *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial,* vol. II., § 1271 (1717); C. O. 324: 10, pp. 443–454, 456–497 (1722); *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial,* vol. III., § 58 (1724); C. O. 5: 1296, pp. 120–130; *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial,* IV. 763–764 (1766).

Dr. O. M. Dickerson, in commenting on this paper at the Charleston meeting, expressed his belief that seventy-five per cent. of the "vetoes" of colonial laws must be explained on other than commercial grounds. Until the royal disallowances have been collected and their contents analyzed, we are hardly in a position to speak very positively about their numerical proportions, but after studying with considerable care those in print and in manuscript relating to all the colonies for the entire colonial period, I am convinced that Dr. Dickerson's percentage is too high. Dr. Dickerson must have failed to realize that scores of disallowances apparently concerned with other than commercial matters are found on closer inspection to have a trade motive somewhere lurking in them. This is particularly true of all that deal with financial legislation. But after all can we determine the place of trade and commerce in colonial history by simply counting the number of laws passed and disallowed that deal with this subject? I think not. The colonists had frequent warnings that legislation affecting trade or discriminating in any way against British merchants or British commodities would not be tolerated, and the governors were expressly instructed to veto such laws. It would be surprising, therefore, if any large number of such laws had been passed wittingly by the colonial legislatures. We can obtain a much more accurate estimate by studying the motives underlying British policy in this respect, as seen in the reports of the Board of Trade and of the Council Committee. Among the reasons for disallowance that stand out above all others are two: the impairment of trade and the infringement of the royal prerogative. Many of the other reasons are technical as having to do with the legal aspects of the case, and none of them to anything like the same degree represent the fundamental principles governing the relations of mother-country and colonies as do the two named above. In 1766 the Board of Trade itself summed up the leading motives controlling the disallowance, as "the Commerce and Manufactures of this country", "Your Majesty's Royal Prerogative", and "the Authority of the British Parliament". It will be noticed that trade and commerce are mentioned first. *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial,* V. 43.

Privy Council. It gave rise to the thousand and one complicated phases of international finance, involving mercantile dealings and transactions, currency, credit, and exchange, gold, silver, copper, and paper money, bills of exchange and rates of exchange, the drift of bullion from colony to colony, and above all that question, sometimes most difficult to answer in the case of individual colonies, of the balance of trade. It touched very closely the attitude of the Board of Trade, the Privy Council, and Parliament toward bills of credit and colonial banking, a phase of our early financial history that has nowhere been studied in its entirety. As we continue to the uttermost reaches of this subtle and penetrating force, we find ourselves in the very centre of colonial life, discovering unexpected traces of its influence upon other phases of colonial activity that seem at first sight far removed from the sphere of the Navigation Acts and all their works.

Thus we see how large is the field within which the commercial policy of England operated and how deep and far-reaching were the effects of this powerful agent in shaping the development of colonial history. In the aggregate, the results of this policy, which England by virtue of her sovereign authority was endeavoring to force upon the colonies, constitute an impressive picture, the details of which are so interwoven with the general life of the colonies as to be inseparable from it. From the historian they deserve and are capable of such treatment as will furnish an orderly and logical presentation of this neglected phase of our history.

Turning now to the second part of our general subject, we shall see that colonial commerce, quite apart from its connection with England's policy, was a dominant interest of the colonists themselves. There is danger lurking in the new point of view we are taking, the danger of giving exaggerated treatment to governmental policy and neglecting those parts of the story that represent colonial activity and private enterprise. We are right in taking our stand in the mother-country and in following thence the diverging lines of governmental influence in the colonies themselves. But when once these features of our subject have been outlined there still remains another and equally important group of subjects to be studied, the actual commercial and industrial conditions in the colonies and the extent to which these conditions reacted upon the policy at home. British governmental policy on one side and colonial organization and development on the other are but the complementary parts of a common subject. Each is incomplete without the other, and neither can be fully understood unless the other has been adequately and impartially presented.

To the colonists in America a commercial and trading life was the natural accompaniment of their geographical location. The colonists did not confine their interests, as do most of our historians, to the fringe of coast from Maine to Georgia. They ranged over a larger world, the world of the North Atlantic, a great ocean-lake, bounded on the east by the coast of two continents, Europe and Africa, and on the west by the coast of a third continent, America. On the northeast, the British Isles occupied a vantage-point of great commercial and strategic importance, while within the ocean area were scores of islands, massed chiefly along the southwestern border or off the coast of Africa, from the Bahamas to Curaçao and from the Azores to the Cape Verde Islands, which held positions of the highest importance for purposes of trade and naval warfare. It is an interesting fact that the British island colonies, and still more those of France, Holland, and Denmark, have been mere names to the students of our history; and it is equally significant that no atlas of American history displays in full upon any of its maps the entire field of colonial life. The American colonists were not landsmen only, they were seafarers also. They faced wide stretches of water, over which they looked, upon which hundreds of them spent their lives, and from which came in largest part their wealth and their profits. Though migration into the interior began early, nearly half the eighteenth century had spent its course before the American colonists turned their faces in serious earnest toward the region of the west. Though the lives of thousands were spent as frontiersmen and pioneers, as many crossed the sea as penetrated the land, for colonial interstate commerce was not by land but by water. In the shaping of colonial careers and colonial governments, sea-faring and trade were only second in importance to the physical conditions of the land upon which the colonists dwelt. No one can write of the history of Portsmouth, Salem, Boston, Newport, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia, or Charleston, or of the tidewater regions of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, without realizing the conspicuous part that commerce played in the lives of those communities and regions. Even within the narrower confines of their own bays and rivers, the colonists of continental America, particularly of the northern part, spent much of their time upon the water. They travelled but rarely by land, unless compelled to do so; they engaged in coastwise trade that carried them from Newfoundland to South Carolina; they built, in all the colonies, but more particularly in New England, hundreds of small craft, which penetrated every harbor, bay, estuary, and navigable river along a coast remarkable for the natural advantages it offered for transit, trans-

port, and traffic by water; and they devoted no small part of their time and energies as governors, councillors, and assemblymen to the furthering of a business which directly or indirectly concerned every individual, and which became more exigent and effective as the numbers of the colonists increased and their economic resources expanded.

In elaborating this phase of our subject we are called upon to deal with certain aspects which, though inseparable from the larger theme, are more strictly colonial in their characteristics and connections. I refer to staple products, shipping, trade routes, and markets, and in close connection with these are the various aspects of commercial legislation in the colonies themselves. A study of staple products demands that we survey the entire agricultural and industrial history of the colonies from Hudson Bay to Surinam, and enter upon a discriminating analysis of the economic importance of their chief products from furs to sugar and from fish to lime-juice. A study of shipping for the purpose in hand demands that we find out where ships were built, what was their tonnage, and how they were manned, and acquire some knowledge of the fitness of certain types of vessels for ocean, island, and coastwise service, according to their size and rig. The study of trade routes, one of the most varied and tangled of problems, demands that we determine the customary routes with all their variations, examine the reasons why these routes came into being, analyze the conditions attending traffic by these routes, and follow each route from port to port, as far as descriptions, logs, and registers will allow, instead of being content to see the captains and masters sail out into the unknown and return from the unknown, with very indefinite ideas as to where they had been and what they had done there. A study of markets requires that we have some fairly exact knowledge of the staple demands of other countries and colonies than our own, of the conditions under which our colonial staples were distributed, and of the nature of the commodities that other countries could offer to the captains and supercargoes wherewith to lade their vessels, either for the return trip, for the next stage of a long voyage that might cover many countries, or for the kind of huckstering business that many masters engaged in, going from port to port as they saw opportunities for profit.

Having presented these general features of this phase of our subject, I should like to state somewhat more exactly what I have in mind, and to discuss at somewhat greater length topics which, though commonly classed as economic, are in no way the peculiar property of the student of so-called economic history. First of all as to staple

products. In the far north, from Hudson Bay to Nova Scotia, Maine, and New Hampshire, furs, fish, and lumber predominated. These same staples were also of importance to central and southern New England, in addition to whale-fins and whale-oil, but the main products here were agricultural, including live-stock, naval stores, and also a great variety of provisions, many in their natural state and others dried, salted, and pickled, with some articles of wooden ware, among which were jocularly classed the wooden clocks and nutmegs of Connecticut. New England differed from her neighbor colonies to the immediate southward, not so much in the character of the staples exported as in the possession of large numbers of shipping ports through which she sent her surplus products to the world outside. New York, including within its area of supply Long Island, Westchester County, and the Hudson and Mohawk river valleys, exported a similar variety of domestic staples, with a greater amount of bread-stuffs and peltry, but lagged behind such towns as Salem, Boston, Newport, and Philadelphia in the extent of her export business. Though sharing with Albany and Perth Amboy the trade of the region, she surpassed all the others as an entrepôt for re-exported commodities from the tropical colonies. Philadelphia was wholly absorbed in commerce, and early became the main port, with Burlington and Salem as subsidiary, through which the farmers of Pennsylvania and West New Jersey and the tobacco raisers of Delaware sent their supplies. She specialized in wheat, beef, pork, and lumber, and during colonial times was the greatest mercantile city of the colonial world. She raised almost no staple suitable for export to England and did but a small re-exporting business. As she drew practically all manufactured commodities from England, the balance of trade in that direction was heavily against her. Thus we have in one group what are commonly known as the "bread colonies", possessed of diversified staples, similar in many cases to those that England produced for herself.

South of Mason and Dixon's line we enter the group of single staple colonies, in which the export was confined to a single commodity or to a small number of commodities. Maryland and Virginia raised very little except tobacco until after the middle of the eighteenth century, when the export of grain, largely to the West Indies, marked the beginnings of trade with the tropical colonies and laid the foundations of the prosperity of Baltimore and Norfolk. North Carolina in the seventeenth century was relatively unimportant as an exporting colony, supplying only tobacco to New England traders who shipped it to England; but afterward, particularly in the southern section, from the plantations along the Cape Fear

River, she developed a variety of staples, live-stock, naval stores, and provisions, and entered upon a considerable exporting activity. South Carolina was a long time in finding her staple industry, but the enumeration of rice in 1704 shows that out of the diversified commerce of the earlier era had come the one product that was to be the chief source of her wealth. In the eighteenth century rice, indigo, naval stores, furs, cypress, and cedar made up the bulk of her cargoes. Among the island colonies, Bermuda and the Bahamas, having no sugar and little tobacco, played but little part in the commercial life of the colonies. But with the West Indies—Jamaica, Barbadoes, and the Leeward Islands—we are face to face with that group known as the "sugar colonies" which formed till 1760 the leading factor in England's commercial scheme. Conspicuous among colonial staples were the products of these islands, sugar, molasses, and rum, with a small amount of indigo, cotton, ginger, allspice, and woods for cabinet work and dyeing purposes, some of which came from the mainland of Honduras. The contrast of the "bread colonies" and the "sugar colonies" forms one of the leading features of colonial history, and in their respective careers we have the operation of forces that explain many things in the course of colonial development.

With shipping we deal first of all with the actual extent of the ship-building industry, regarding which at present we have no very exact statistical information. Weeden has given us for New England an admirable, though rather miscellaneous, collection of facts that stand badly in need of organization. All the leading towns of the North had dock-yards and built ships, and many of the smaller towns on sea-coast and navigable rivers laid the keels of lesser craft. So rapidly did the business increase that New England after 1700 was not only doing a large carrying trade on her own account, but was selling vessels in all parts of the Atlantic world—in the southern colonies and in the West Indies, Spain, Portugal, and England. The golden age of New England ship-building was during the first third of the eighteenth century, and so rapid was the growth of the business that in 1724 English shipwrights of the port of London would have had a law passed forbidding the New Englanders to build ships or compelling them to sell their ships after their arrival in England. But here the colonists scored, for, as the counsellor of the Board of Trade said, the English ship-builders had no remedy, since by the Acts of Navigation the shipping of the plantations was in all respects to be considered as English-built. Later the business fell off, the centre of the ship-building activity moved north to north-eastern Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and the English builders

ceased to be concerned. New York, too, had her ship-yards, as had northern New Jersey, that of Rip Van Dam occupying the water front on the North River in the rear of Trinity churchyard; and Philadelphia, the chief ship-building city in America, in the years between 1727 and 1766, built nearly half the entire number that were entered in the ship-registry of the port during those years. In the South ship-building was less of a negligible factor than has commonly been assumed. Maryland in 1700 had 161 ships, sloops, and shallops, built or building along the Chesapeake, and some of these were large enough to engage in the English trade. Virginia built chiefly, but not entirely, for river and bay traffic, and North Carolina, though hampered by the want of good ports and harbors, made ship-building one of the established industries of the colony. South Carolina carried on her great trade with Europe chiefly in British bottoms and during the eighteenth century had scarcely a dozen ships at any one time that belonged to the province. Among the island colonies only Bermuda and the Bahamas played any part as ship-builders; while the others, early denuded of available timber, remained entirely dependent on outside carriers.

In size, the New England built vessels were mainly under 100 tons, with a large proportion of vessels of less than 20 tons, in which, however, ocean voyages were sometimes made. Occasionally vessels were built of 250 and 300 tons, and a few, monster ships for those days, reached 700 and 800 tons. Gabriel Thomas tells us that ships of 200 tons were built in Philadelphia, but the largest ship entered in the register mentioned above was of 150 tons, with others ranging all the way down to 4 tons. The Maryland lists mention vessels of 300 and 400 tons built in that colony, but the number could not have been large. In 1767 a vessel of 256 tons was offered for sale before launching in Virginia.

Five varieties of vessels were in use: (1) ships and pinks, three-masters with square rig; (2) snows and barks, also three-masters, but with one mast rigged fore-and-aft; (3) ketches, brigs, and brigantines, with two masts but of different sizes, combining square rig with fore-and-aft, and schooners, a native American product, with fore-and-aft rig on both masts, though in its development the schooner often carried more masts than two, without change in the cut of the sails; (4) sloops, shallops, and smacks, single-masters carrying fore-and-aft sails; and (5) boats without masts—hog-boats, fly-boats, wherries, row-boats, and canoes. Bermuda boats were conspicuous among colonial vessels, because rigged with mutton-leg sails. No statement regarding relative numbers can be made until far more information has been gathered than exists at present, but

the proportion of three-masters, two-masters, and single-masters was somewhat in the ratio of one, two, and three. Of the numbers of seamen we know as yet very little.

Turning now to the complicated question of routes, which criss-crossed so bewilderingly the waters of the Atlantic, we can, I think, group the courses without difficulty, if we keep in mind the nature of supply and demand and the requirements of the Navigation Acts.

The first determining factor was the requirement that all the enumerated commodities—tobacco, sugar, cotton, indigo, ginger, fustic and other dye woods, and later cocoa, molasses, rice, naval stores, copper, beaver and other skins—be carried directly to England, or from one British plantation to another for the supply of local wants, whence, if re-exported, they were to go to England. This requirement gives us our first set of trade routes. The chief staples of all the colonies from Maryland to Barbadoes were carried to England in fleets of vessels provided by English merchants that during the days of convoys went out in the early winter, about Christmas time, and returned to England in the spring. The providing of naval protection in times of war was a matter of constant concern to the Admiralty, while the gathering of vessels and the arranging of seasons was one of concern to the merchants. After 1713 when convoying became largely unnecessary except to the West Indies, individual ships sailed at varying times, frequently returning from Maryland or Virginia as late as the end of August. We may call this route back and forth across the ocean between England and her southern and West Indian colonies the great thoroughfare of our colonial commerce. It was regular, dignified, and substantial. Out of it grew two subsidiary routes, one from New York and New England with re-exported commodities to England, and one from South Carolina and Georgia to southern Europe under the privilege allowed after 1730 and 1735 of exporting rice directly to all points south of Cape Finisterre. Thus we have a series of direct routes from nearly all of the American colonies converging upon England and one route from South Carolina and Georgia diverging to any point south of France, but generally confined to the Iberian Peninsula and the Straits. Along these routes were carried a definite series of commodities, raised, with the exception of naval stores and beaver, entirely in colonies south of Pennsylvania. To this commercial activity must be added the traffic in these same commodities among the colonists themselves, a service chiefly in the hands of the northerners, who carried tobacco, rice, logwood, and sugar from the southern and West Indian colonies to their own ports and there either consumed them, re-exported them to England,

or in the case of sugar and molasses worked them over into rum and shipped the latter where they pleased.

When we consider the export activities of the northern colonies, we find ourselves involved in a more varied and complicated series of voyages. First, all the colonies north of Maryland, except Pennsylvania, had a certain but not very extensive trade directly with England. They carried in greater or less quantities an assortment of furs, fish, rawhides, lumber, whale-fins and whale-oil, naval stores, wheat, wheat flour, hops, and a little iron, though the largest amount of exported iron came from Maryland and Virginia. They also re-exported tobacco, sugar, molasses, rum, cocoa, hard woods, and dye woods. All these they carried in their own ships as a rule, and because their own products were not sufficient to balance what they wished to buy, they frequently sold their ships also to English merchants. Salem, Newport, and New York were the chief centres of the English trade. Secondly, the northern colonies carried on a very large trade in non-enumerated commodities with the countries of Europe. To various ports, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, they sent quantities of "merchantable" fish, lumber, flour, train oil, and rice and naval stores before they were enumerated, chiefly to Spain, Portugal, southern French ports, and Leghorn, the mart of the Mediterranean. A few ships appear to have crept through the Sound into the Baltic; others, very rarely, went up the Adriatic to Venice; and in the case of a few enterprising merchants, notably John Ross of Philadelphia, vessels were sent to India and the East, though in 1715 New England reported no trade there, only a few privateers having occasionally "strol'd that way and [taken] some rich prizes".

The bulk of the northern trade, however, was not with Europe but with the West Indies and with the other continental colonies. The ramifications of this branch of colonial commerce were almost endless, the routes followed were most diverse, and the commodities exported included almost every staple, native or foreign, that was current in the colonial world. Philadelphia and New York traded chiefly with the West Indies and concerned themselves less than did New England with the coastwise traffic; but the New Englanders, in their hundreds of vessels of small tonnage, went to Newfoundland and Annapolis Royal with provisions, salt, and rum, to New York, the Jerseys, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Bermuda, and the Caribbee Islands, peddling every known commodity that they could lay their hands on—meats, vegetables, fruits, flour, Indian meal, refuse fish, oil, candles, soap, butter, cider, beer, cranberries, horses, sheep, cows, and oxen, pipe-

staves, deal boards, hoops, and shingles, earthenware and woodenware, and other similar commodities of their own; and tobacco, sugar, rum, and molasses, salt, naval stores, wines, and various manufactured goods which they imported from England. They went to Monte Cristi, Cape François, Surinam, and Curaçao, to the islands off the coast of Africa, commonly known as the Wine Islands, and there they trafficked and bargained as only the New Englander knew how to traffic and bargain. It was a peddling and huckstering business, involving an enormous amount of petty detail, frequent exchanges, and a constant lading and unlading as the captains and masters moved from port to port. Sometimes great rafts of lumber were floated down from Maine, New Hampshire, and the Delaware, and not infrequently New England ships went directly to Honduras for logwood and to Tortuga and Turks Island for salt.

Let us consider the return routes. With the southern and West Indian colonies the problem was a simple one. The merchant ships from England went as a rule directly to the colonies, generally laden with English and Continental manufactured goods that according to the act of 1663 could be obtained by the colonists only through England. They followed usually the same route coming and going, though occasionally a ship-captain would go from England to Guinea where he would take on a few negroes for the colonies. Maryland seems to have obtained nearly all her negroes in that way.

But with the northern colonies, where the vessel started in the first instance from the colony, the routes were rarely the same. A vessel might go to England, huckstering from port to port until the cargo was disposed of, and then return to America with manufactured goods. It might go to England with lumber, flour, furs, and naval stores, then back to Newfoundland for fish, then to Lisbon or the Straits, then to England with Continental articles, and thence back to the starting point. It might go directly to Spain, Portugal, or Italy, trying one port after another, Cadiz, Bilbao, Alicante, Carthagena, Marseilles, Toulon, Leghorn, and Genoa, thence to England, and thence to America. It might go directly to the Wine Islands and return by the same route with the wines of Madeira and Fayal and the Canaries, though it was a debatable question whether Canary wines were not to be classed with Continental commodities and so to be carried to America by way of England only. It might go to Spain or Portugal, thence to the Wine Islands, thence to Senegambia or Goree or the Guinea coast for beeswax, gums, and ivory, thence back to Lisbon and home by way of England; or, if it were a slave ship, it might go to the Guinea coast, thence to Barbadoes, and home, or as was probably common, to

Barbadoes first, thence to Africa, thence back to the West Indies and home, with a mixed cargo of negroes, sugar, and cash. Frequently the captain sold his cargo and even his ship for cash, and if he did this in Europe, or in England to London or Bristol merchants, he would either return with the money or invest it in manufactured goods, which he would ship on some homeward-bound vessel, returning himself with his invoice. With the New Englander, and to a somewhat lesser degree with the New Yorker and Philadelphian, the variations were as great as were the opportunities for traffic.

In this brief statement, I have given but a bare outline of a difficult and unworked problem in colonial history. Did time allow I should like to consider certain supplemental phases of the general subject that are deserving of careful attention. These are, first, the methods of distributing colonial commodities in England and Wales and of sending them into the interior, into Scotland, and into Ireland; secondly, the character and extent of the plantation trade with Ireland and Scotland directly, a matter of some interest and a good deal of difficulty; and thirdly, the re-exportation of tobacco, sugar, and other tropical and semi-tropical products from England to the European Continent. But upon these subjects I can say nothing here. One topic must, however, be briefly discussed, the question of illicit trade and smuggling.

The nature of the smuggling that went on during our colonial period is very simple, though the extent of it and the relation of it to the total volume of colonial trade is very difficult to determine. It is doubtful if satisfactory conclusions can ever be reached on these points, owing both to the lack of evidence and to its unsatisfactory character. For the most part smuggling took three forms: first, direct trade in enumerated commodities between the colonies and European countries, and participated in by English, Irish, American, and West Indian ships, trafficking to Holland, Hamburg, Spain, Portugal, Marseilles, Toulon, and other Mediterranean ports; secondly, a direct return trade to America or the West Indies, without touching at England as the law required, and participated in by the same ships, carrying the dry goods, wines, and brandies of Europe. The latter traffic had many aspects, for it included the trade between American British colonies and American foreign colonies, in which enumerated commodities, or in many cases non-enumerated commodities, were exchanged for European goods, purchasable at St. Eustatius, St. Thomas, or Curaçao, or at Monte Cristi in Hispaniola. There can be little doubt that this trade attained considerable proportions and was one of the channels whereby brandies, cocoa, silks, linens, and the like came into the colonies. There was

much smuggled liquor drunk in the West Indies, and many were the damask gowns and silk stockings worn; and I fear that there were many things enjoyed in Newport, Boston, and Philadelphia that came either directly from France or by way of the foreign West Indies. Indeed, it seems to have been a common practice for ships of nearly every continental colony to go to Curaçao and return with European dry goods and cocoa.

Thirdly, there was a trade of the northern colonies with the foreign West Indies, in which a vessel would carry a general cargo to Jamaica or Barbadoes, sell all or a part of it for cash—gold or light silver—pass on to the French colonies of Guadeloupe, Martinique, or Santo Domingo, or to the Dutch colony of St. Eustatius, and there buy, more cheaply than at Jamaica, Barbadoes, or the Leeward Islands, their return cargo of sugar and molasses. There was nothing strictly illegal about this traffic, unless the northern trader laid out a part of his cash in European dry goods and smuggled them into the colonies by one or other of the many contrivances so well known to all West Indian traders; but it was injurious to the British sugar colonies in depriving them of a part of their market and draining them of much of their cash. It became illegal, however, when, after the passage of the Molasses Act, expressly designed to prevent this traffic, the Northerner evaded the duties imposed by this act on foreign sugar and molasses. Then if he brought in foreign sugar and molasses without paying the duty and on the same voyage stowed away hidden bales of Holland linens and French silks, casks of French brandies, and pipes of claret, he committed a double breach of the law. Lastly, if we were to go into the problem of illicit trade in all its phases, we should have to consider a certain amount of petty smuggling off Newfoundland, in Ireland, and at the Isle of Man, and by way of the Channel Islands; but upon these points our knowledge is at present very meagre.

A useful addition to this paper would be a statement regarding our sources of information, in manuscript in England and America, and in print in a great number of accessible works. There is an immense amount of available material in the form of correspondence, accounts, registers, lists, reports, returns, log-books, port books, statements of claims, letter-books, and the like, which, though often difficult to use, are all workable and illuminating to the student who has organized his plan of treatment in a logical and not a haphazard fashion. The subject is a fascinating one, and the more one studies it, the more important and suggestive it becomes. I cannot believe that the future will show such a disregard of its significance as the past has done, for when its place is once recognized and its in-

fluence determined, colonial history will become not only fuller and richer, but also more picturesque, and the life of the colonists will appear as broader and more varied. And just as the local field will be enlarged and extended, so will the place of the colonies in the British and European systems of commercial empire be given its proper setting, and the balance between things imperial and things colonial will be restored. Only when such balance has been sought for and attained will the way be prepared for a history of the colonial period that is comprehensive in scope, scientific in conception, and thoroughly scholarly in its mode of treatment.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

THE ANGLICAN OUTLOOK ON THE AMERICAN COLONIES IN THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY[1]

In Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France,* there is a notable passage describing the importance of the Established Church in the English social fabric. He speaks of the establishment as "the first of our prejudices, not a prejudice destitute of reason, but involving in it profound and extensive wisdom". In a spirit of veneration like that in which he contemplated the national constitution, he saw in the church the living embodiment in the present of the "early received, and uniformly continued sense of mankind".[2] What Burke wrote in 1790 applied with greater force to the early eighteenth century. Whatever its spiritual limitations may have been, the popularity of the church was then so great as to endanger the Revolution settlement of 1689, and the grudging concessions to dissenters embodied in the Toleration Act.

In sharp contrast to the situation at home was the humiliating weakness of the church beyond the sea. In the new English commonwealths, this "first of English prejudices" had largely lost its force. Of the continental colonies, which in 1700 included a great majority of the white population in America under the English flag, only the two Chesapeake provinces of Virginia and Maryland had a measurably effective establishment of the Anglican Church; and even here English ecclesiastical law and custom were largely inoperative. Without a resident bishop, the important offices of confirmation and ordination could not be administered and though the Bishop of London was represented in Virginia by a commissary, a considerable part of the episcopal jurisdiction was exercised by the colonial governor. Commissary and parish clergy alike were dependent upon the passing moods of the laity to an extent quite inconsistent with the approved Anglican theory. In New England the situation was even worse. There was indeed an effective church establishment, but it was based upon principles sharply antagonistic to those of the mother-country. The other colonies had been

[1] A paper read in the conference on American religious history at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Charleston, December 29, 1913.

[2] *Works* (London, 1852), IV. 225–226.

founded by proprietors, who though often themselves Anglicans, sometimes indeed as in the case of Lord Clarendon aggressive High Churchmen, were controlled mainly by considerations of economic interest and trusted that a variety of religious opinions, held by people so far away, would be "no breach of the unity and uniformity"[3] thought necessary at home. In the most vigorous of the middle colonies, the prevailing religious influence was that of the Society of Friends, whose members combined the most thoroughgoing theories of religious individualism with an extraordinary capacity for cooperative action in defense of their common interests.

Under these depressing conditions a few energetic churchmen, in the first decade of the eighteenth century, took up the difficult problem of colonial missions. At a time when merchants and statesmen were working with fair success for an imperial system in trade and government, it was natural to think also of an imperialistic policy for the national church. This ecclesiastical imperialism was doubtless supported in part by political considerations; but the character of its chief promoters, many of whom were actively associated with various forms of practical piety at home, is sufficient to show that the movement had also a truly religious aspect.[4]

The two chief agencies of Anglican extension in the colonies during this period were the Bishop of London and the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, chartered by William III. in 1701.[5] The jurisdiction of the diocese of London in the colonies and the long-continued service of Bishop Compton, which, beginning under Charles II., covered the greater part of Queen Anne's reign, have been described in Cross's well-known monograph.[6] The work of the society, sometimes designated as the Venerable Society, or more briefly still as the S. P. G., has been described in various publications written from a distinctly Anglican point of view, of which the most valuable is Mr. C. F. Pascoe's *Two Centuries of the S. P. G.*, based mainly on the Journal of the society and the correspondence on file in its London office.[7] It is the purpose of the present paper

[3] Carolina charter, 1663, § 18.

[4] Dr. Thomas Bray is perhaps the most notable for the variety of religious societies with which he was associated. For other illustrations see C. F. Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, and Overton, *Life in the English Church, 1660–1714* (index of both, *sub* T. Bray, Josiah Woodward, Thomas Tenison, Robert Nelson). See also Overton, ch. V. ("Religious and Philanthropical Societies"). *Cf.* Allen and McClure, *History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, ch. II.

[5] Charter in Pascoe, *op. cit.*, pp. 932–934.

[6] A. L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies.*

[7] The most important of the early accounts is that of Humphreys, secretary of the society, *An Historical Account of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (London, 1730).

to interpret, in the light of this original material, the Anglican outlook on the colonial problem in the early years of the eighteenth century.

The S. P. G., though not technically an official agency of the church, had nevertheless a quasi-official character.[8] Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury, was named in the charter as the first president of the society and he was regularly chosen to the same office by annual election as long as he lived. Tenison was a moderate churchman, more conspicuous for practical piety than for controversial theology, and his activities in relation to the colonial church have not been adequately recognized.[9] The minutes of the society show conclusively that his presidency was of no perfunctory kind. By a standing order of the society, minutes of its own action and that of its executive committee were to be sent to the archbishop as well as to the Bishop of London. In the later years of Tenison's presidency, when he rarely attended the sessions in person, it was usual to make action on important matters conditional upon his approval.[10] The relations of the society with the Bishop of London were also very close. He was asked for information about colonial needs and in turn depended upon the society for the funds required to support the American clergy. In fact his control of the colonial church was materially restricted by his financial dependence; for the society, not content with episcopal testimonials, conducted its own examination of candidates for the missionary service, reserving the right of dismissal for misconduct.[11] In general there was friendly and effective co-operation, with occasional friction, as in 1709, when the bishop expressed his disappointment that there should have been "any rubb" in the appointment on liberal terms of one of his candidates, who in his opinion "would do as much good as ten others".[12] Other bishops took a more or less active part in the society's work. Among them was Gilbert Burnet, who with all his multifarious activities as churchman, politician, and historian was able to attend numerous meetings of the society.[13] Burnet belonged to the latitu-

[8] The activity of Dr. Thomas Bray in the founding of this society and of its predecessor, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, is well known. Doubtless his part was larger than that of any other individual. See Steiner, *Rev. Thomas Bray,* in Maryland Hist. Soc. *Fund Publications,* no. 37. *Cf.* Pascoe, ch. I.

[9] W. H. Hutton's "Tenison" in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* *Cf.* Overton, *Life in the English Church, 1660–1714,* pp. 60–62.

[10] S. P. G. Journal, May 17, 1706, and *passim, e. g.,* June, July, 1711.

[11] *Ibid.,* September 17, 1703; November 17, December 15, 1704; May 18, June 15, 1705.

[12] S. P. G., Letters Received, A V., nos. 29–32.

[13] *E. g.,* S. P. G. Journal, 1711, *passim.*

dinarian group which included also White Kennett, afterwards bishop of Peterborough. Of the High Church bishops who took an active part in the society's affairs, Patrick, bishop of Ely, was perhaps the most notable. Thus the outlook of the society on the American situation was in the main that of responsible leaders in the Church of England.

Notwithstanding its connection with a richly endowed church, the financial resources of the society were meagre indeed. In 1707 the annual charges for missions and schools amounted to £1065 with yearly subscriptions not exceeding £759; and at the next annual meeting it was reported that the annual income from all sources including casual benefactions was less than a thousand pounds, with fixed and contingent charges more than £400 in excess of that amount.[14] In 1709–1710 the auditing committee reported a yearly charge of £1251 exclusive of about £150 for books given to missionaries. The disbursements exceeded the certain yearly income by nearly £500.[15] Many members, including some of the bishops, failed to pay their dues promptly. In 1706 the Bishops of Hereford and Bristol had to be notified of arrears and in 1708 the Bishop of Gloucester asked to have his subscription stopped. In March, 1709/10, members were in arrears for dues to the amount of £729. Bishop Burnet urged greater efforts to secure contributions from the merchants of London and other towns interested in the colonial trade, but little was accomplished.[16] In short, the church as a whole hardly appreciated the importance of its task.

The stipends paid to missionaries were small. Some of the first grants were as low as £50 per annum, with smaller allowances for books, to which must be added the royal bonus of £20 paid to each clergyman on his entering the colonial service.[17] Since the society worked mainly in provinces where there was no general establishment of the Anglican Church and since the missionaries them-

[14] *Ibid.*, July 18, 1707; February 20, 1707/8; Letters Received A IV., no. 25.

[15] S. P. G. Journal, February 17, 1709/10. The *Abstracts* for the next three years show somewhat larger amounts. In one year the estimated disbursements were £1745.

[16] S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., April 5, 1703; Journal, February 21, 1706/7. Some conspicuous London merchants were, however, enlisted. Micajah Perry, one of the best known and most influential of the "merchants trading to the colonies" became a member and made a gift of land in New Jersey. *Ibid.*, January 20, February 20, March 3, 1709/10. *Cf.* Burnet's *Sermon before the Society*, 1703/4, p. 22: "You great Dealers in Trade, who have had so plentiful a Harvest in Temporal things, from the Productions of those Countries, and from the Industry of our Colonies settled among them, are, in a more special manner, bound to minister to them in spiritual things."

[17] *E. g.*, S. P. G. Journal, June 15, 1705.

selves were often reluctant to alienate actual or possible adherents by premature appeals for money, there was often little to depend upon besides the grants from England. To meet this situation various plans were offered. In 1701 Lewis Morris of New Jersey proposed that no one be appointed to "a great Benefice" in England, "but such as shall oblige themselves to preach three years gratis in America"; with part of the living the incumbent was to maintain a curate for his English parish.[18] In 1702 George Keith and others made a similar proposal.[19] The favorite solution of the problem of clerical maintenance was the enactment by the colonial legislatures of laws securing a general establishment of the Anglican Church. In most provinces, however, especially in the middle colonies, this solution was impracticable; and where, as in South Carolina, the attempt was partially successful, it did much to embitter the politics of the province.

With small stipends, the ordeal of an ocean voyage,[20] and the numerous hardships of colonial life in prospect, the missionary service did not appeal to many of the English clergy and some of those who applied were evidently men who could not make their way at home. The Journal contains numerous instances of missionaries found guilty of various forms of misconduct, though they show also an increasing care in the selection of candidates.[21] Several Scottish clergymen were enlisted to offset the lack of suitable English material, sometimes with unsatisfactory results, as when a Delaware parish complained of the Scottish clergy in the neighborhood and urged that "no minister of that nation" be sent to them.[22] Nevertheless some good men were attracted to the service. Governor Hunter of New York, by no means an undiscriminating admirer of the Anglican clergy, thought he had in his neighborhood "a good Sett of Missionaries who generally labour hard in their Functions and are men of good lives and ability".[23]

The first important move of the society was the sending out of

[18] Memorial in S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 1.

[19] Statement by Keith *et al., ibid.*, no. 24.

[20] A vivid description of fairly common experiences is given in a letter of B. Dennis to the secretary, S. P. G. Letters Received, A VI., no. 76. The society itself recognized "how natural it is for Young Divines to decline the Difficulties and Dangers of such a Mission, if they have any tolerable Prospects nearer Home". Annual *Abstract*, 1710/11.

[21] S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 31; A II., no. 5; A V., no. 47; A VI., no. 26. Journal, August 18, 1704; March 2, May 18, 1705; April 19, 1706; November 18, 1709.

[22] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 44.

[23] *Ibid.*, A VI., no. 7; *cf. N. J. Docs.*, IV. 155–158, 173–174. In addition to the missionaries a number of schoolmasters were employed by the society.

George Keith as an itinerant missionary to survey the whole colonial field. This able and picturesque individual had an erratic ecclesiastical record. Beginning as a Scottish Presbyterian, he became a leader among the Pennsylvania Quakers. A little later he organized a seceding group called after him the Keithian Quakers, and in 1700 he entered the last phase by taking orders in the Anglican Church, to which he brought the fiery zeal and controversial temper of a recent convert.[24] On his way across the Atlantic Keith made a notable disciple in the person of John Talbot, a navy chaplain who gave up his position to accompany Keith on his missionary journey. The two men proved congenial spirits. Both were hard fighters and indefatigable workers. Confident of the justice of their cause, they seem never to have been so happy as when engaged in plain-spoken, not to say violent, controversy with their Puritan, and more especially, Quaker opponents.[25] How effective they were in this campaign, it is not easy to say. The Anglicans were generally proud of Keith and thought he had been successful in winning proselytes. The ardent John Talbot was especially enthusiastic about his colleague, whom he called "an able Disputant and a Perfect honest man . . . in a word *Hereticorum Malleus*".[26] The American Quakers, who had been duly warned of Keith's coming, were equally confident that the victory rested with them. "As to that Implacable Adversary of Truth and the People of God, G. K.", wrote the Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting, "he hath in the main done Truth no disservice in these parts, tho' he has done his utmost Towards it."[27]

In one respect at any rate friends and enemies agree. Keith's missionary journey was evidently conceived as a kind of ecclesiastical duel in which the champions of orthodoxy crossed lances with the defenders of heresy. The requirements of heathen and infidels

[24] "Keith" in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*; Perry, *Hist. of the Amer. Episcopal Church*, vol. I., ch. XII.

[25] Keith's journal was soon afterwards printed under the title, *A Journal of Travels from New-Hampshire to Caratuck on the Continent of North-America* (London, 1706). The manuscript copy of the journal in the society's records varies considerably from the printed text. See Journal, 1704–1706, *passim*, especially September 15, 1704, and January, February, 1705/6; also Journal, app. A, no. 51. Keith's final report was preceded by a number of other communications sent in during the course of his journey. The John Carter Brown Library at Providence reports the acquisition of a large number of Keith's tracts. A biography of Keith, written from the standpoint of historical scholarship rather than that of ecclesiastical partizanship, is much to be desired, and would have real importance for the religious history of his time in England and America.

[26] Lewis Morris to the secretary, Letters Received, A I., no. 48; Nicholson in Journal, app. A, nos. 43, 44; Talbot in Letters Received, A I., no. 119.

[27] London Yearly Meeting (Devonshire House MSS.), Epistles Sent, I. 393–396, and Epistles Received, I. 388.

fell into the background and the chief thought in this long tour from New England to North Carolina was to reclaim dissenters who though they might "profess and call themselves Christians" were conceived at their best as Christians of a decidedly inferior type, and at their worst as hardly better, or even worse, than the infidels themselves. There were some acrimonious controversies with Puritan divines in New England;[28] but the middle colonies were the chief battleground at first and here the Quakers clearly stood out as the most inveterate and formidable antagonists.[29]

It is doubtless possible to emphasize too much the temper displayed in this preliminary tour. While this controversy was going on and after Keith's departure for England in 1704, the society gradually developed the more permanent features of its work. In South Carolina the sending of several missionaries strengthened materially the position of the Church of England, and it was possible to secure some legislation for their support. The insular colonies with Maryland and Virginia remained, for the most part, outside the society's sphere of action. In the middle colonies, the society found only a few scattered parishes of the Anglican Church, notably at New York and Philadelphia, and it was to this region that the largest number of missionaries was sent. In New England there was already a fairly strong church at Boston. Though some other attempts were made in Massachusetts, notably at Braintree,[30] the early efforts of the S. P. G. in this section were centred largely in Rhode Island, with the beginnings of an advance from New York into western Connecticut, the full effect of which was not apparent until many years later.

What now was the primary object of the society in America? Was it the conversion of heathen and infidels or the restoration of Quakers and Puritans to the Anglican fold? The charter itself certainly points to the English colonists as the chief objects of the society's care. Because of the lack of suitable maintenance for the clergy, many of the king's subjects, it was said, "do want the administration of God's Word and Sacraments and seem to be abandoned to Atheism and Infidelity". Besides providing maintenance for the parish clergy, such other measures were to be taken "as may be necessary for the Propagation of the Gospel in those parts". The danger from "Popish superstition and Idolatry" is mentioned,

[28] Keith to Bishop of London, September 4, 1703, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 121. In this letter he describes his pamphlet warfare with President Willard of Harvard and Increase Mather. *Cf.* A I., nos. 45, 50.

[29] Keith to Bray, Letters Received, A I., no. 87; "Account of the State of the Church, 1702", in S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 24.

[30] *Cf.* Perry, *Hist. Collections relating to the American Colonial Church*, III.

but there is no reference to Protestant dissenters nor to the needs of Indians and negroes.[31]

The Dean of Lincoln in his anniversary sermon of 1702 put first the duty of settling "the State of Religion as well as may be among our own people there", and next the conversion of the natives.[32] From the beginning both interests were recognized in some measure, and special attention was given to the establishment of an Iroquois mission. The society engaged in a voluminous but inconclusive correspondence on this subject with a Dutch clergyman, Godfrey Dellius, who had lived in New York and was ready to accept Episcopal ordination; and in 1704 a small subsidy was paid to a Dutch minister at Albany for service among the Indians.[33] Unsuccessful efforts were also made to secure money for this purpose from the Puritan managers of the older "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England".[34] Finally Thorogood Moor, an Anglican clergyman, was selected for this work; but on his arrival at Albany in 1704 his enthusiasm was chilled by the difficulties which confronted him and he soon gave up his post to engage in more congenial labors among the settlers of New Jersey. He consoled himself with the thought that Indian missions could be prosecuted more successfully after the English had been reformed. Besides, the English were rapidly increasing in numbers while the Indians were likely to disappear altogether.[35] Moor thought it probable that in forty years not an Indian would be "seen in our America". "God's Providence in this matter" seemed to him "very wonderful", though he agreed that rum drinking and "some new distempers we have brought amongst them" had contributed largely to this providential result. A missionary sent to the South Carolina frontier was equally discouraged and accepted a parish near Charleston instead.[36]

It was hard to find men in the English church at all comparable to

[31] Charter of 1701 in Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, pp. 932–935. In early sermons before the society the superior missionary zeal of the Roman Church is mentioned as a serious reproach to Protestantism, *e. g.*, Burnet's *Sermon*, 1703/4, p. 25.

[32] *Annual Sermon preached before the Society*, 1701/2, p. 17.

[33] Correspondence of Dellius in S. P. G. Letters Received, *passim*, *e. g.*, A I., nos. 7, 72, 89, 132; Journal, June 18, October 15, 1703; June 16, 1704.

[34] Sir William Ashurst to the secretary, June 30, 1703, Letters Received, A I., no. 92.

[35] Moor's letters in Letters Received, A II., nos. 75, 122. *Cf.* Bishop Burnet's anniversary *Sermon*, 1703/4, p. 20: "Our Designs upon Aliens and Infidels must begin in the Instructing and Reforming our own People." *Cf.* Journal, September 17, 1703.

[36] S. P. G. Journal, June 18, 1703. *Cf.* Marston to Bray, February 2, 1702/3; letters of S. Thomas in Letters Received, A I., nos. 83, 86.

the self-sacrificing and adventurous French Jesuits. Perhaps the practical temper of the English missionary was repelled by the slightness of the results in proportion to the energy expended. Caleb Heathcote, one of the most zealous of the Anglican laymen in New York, pointed out the necessity of sending men who could emulate the French in readiness to bear the hardships of life with the Indians "according to their way and manner". He thought Scotsmen better qualified for such service than Englishmen, but in general believed that the society could spend its money more usefully in caring for those who called themselves Christians.[37] Though as a result of this general attitude, the substantial work of the society was confined mainly to parochial work with the colonists and the Indians and negroes living among them, there was serious dissatisfaction in various quarters. Two South Carolina correspondents wrote to the society in 1705 condemning the South Carolina missionary who had neglected the service assigned him among the Yemassee Indians. They urged that missionaries must not be a "nice delicate sort of People", and dwelt in contrast upon the successful labors of the Spanish friars on the Florida frontier.[38] Robert Livingston, secretary of Indian affairs at Albany, was similarly disappointed by the failure of the Iroquois mission, of which he had been one of the chief advocates.[39]

It must be conceded that the political motive for Indian missions, especially among the Iroquois, was almost if not quite as influential as the religious. In 1704 the secretary of the society, in a letter to the Board of Trade announcing the selection of missionaries for this service, remarked that it was done "in consequence of the representation" made by the board to the queen, and that it did "at least as much concerne the State as the Church".[40] The continuance of the French war and the well-known visit of the Mohawk Indians to London naturally accentuated this political view of the Indian missions. In 1710 Secretary Sunderland wrote a somewhat peremptory letter to the archbishop transmitting an appeal from the visiting sachems on which the society was to report to the queen "without loss of time".[41] It was again pointed out in support of

[37] S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 117.

[38] *Ibid.*, no. 156.

[39] Livingston to the secretary. *Ibid.*, no. 136. *Cf.* S. P. G. Journal, September 17, November 19, 1703, and app. A, no. 29 .

[40] *Docs. rel. to the Col. Hist. of New York,* IV. 1077. *Cf.* representations of the board in *Acts of Privy Council, Colonial,* vol. II., no. 898; S. P. G. Journal, April 16, 1703.

[41] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., nos. 85, 86, 88.

this appeal that delay might be a "point of ill-consequence" not only "of Religion but of State also".[42]

Partly at least as a result of this political pressure, the society reconsidered its whole policy regarding the relative importance of the two main divisions of its work. In the first of three notable resolutions adopted in 1710, it was declared that the design of the organization "dos chiefly and principally relate to the conversion of Heathen and Infidels", a work which was to be prosecuted "preferably to all others". The second resolution proposed the immediate resumption of the Iroquois mission, and the third declared that no more missionaries should be sent among Christians, except to fill vacant positions, until the prior claims of the heathen had been provided for.[43] An elaborate plan for the Iroquois mission was accordingly adopted[44] and a missionary was sent out in 1712. He also failed, however, and in 1719 the mission was suspended.[45]

The comparative ill success of these efforts to serve the Indians naturally strengthened the general conviction of the missionaries that their first duty was to their own misguided countrymen. The "children must first be satisfied and the lost Sheep recovered who have gone astray among hereticks and Quakers".[46]

Assuming that missionary service was to be concerned largely with the recovery of dissenters to the Anglican fold, there was room for much divergence of opinion as to the best means for securing the desired results. Some thought that sound churchmanship was to be promoted by associating with it certain special privileges. Lewis Morris, for instance, suggested in 1701 that no one be appointed governor unless he were a firm churchman and that if possible the

[42] Nicholson to the Archbishop of Canterbury, May 22, 1710. *Ibid.*, no. 94.

[43] S. P. G. Journal, April 21, 1710. *Cf.* anniversary *Sermon* of the Bishop of Norwich, 1709/10, urging conciliatory methods of correcting the errors of Christians in order through the example of the latter to bring the "Native Infidels" into the fold. "For this is what they are always to look on as their principal Business, and that for which this Corporation was primarily erected" (pp. 16–20).

[44] *Ibid.*, April 28, 1710. *Cf.* the *Abstract*, for 1710/11, p. 38.

[45] Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, pp. 70–71. *Cf. Abstracts*, 1712/13, pp. 60–62; 1713/14, pp. 46–49. Humphreys in his *Historical Account* (1730) assumes that the obstacles to missionary work among the Iroquois were insuperable (ch. XI.).

[46] S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 22. It must not be forgotten, however, that considerable attention was given to the Christianizing of negroes. The subject was urged upon the attention of missionaries and some conscientious work was done by them. *Cf.* the summary in Humphreys's *Historical Account*, ch. X. An estimate of the work is given by M. W. Jernegan in a paper on "Christianity and Slavery in the American Colonies", read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Charleston, December 29, 1913 [and to be printed before long in this journal].

same test be applied to councillors and magistrates. In general, churchmen should have "peculiar Privileges above others", preferably by act of Parliament.[47] In 1705 the colonial clergy assembled at Burlington suggested in a similar spirit that the exclusion from certain offices of those who failed to "Frequent the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" might be a good way of weakening the schism.[48] The general principle had just been applied in the well-known South Carolina law imposing a sacramental test for membership in the assembly, which was subsequently repealed through the intervention of the crown. Ill adapted as these proposals were to American conditions, they came naturally enough from a generation which was already accustomed to the English Test and Corporation acts and was soon to see the enactment of the Occasional Conformity Bill and the Schism Act.

Some missionaries advocated more conciliatory methods and were even ready to take liberties with the rubric in order to disarm Puritan prejudices. For instance, a missionary on Long Island thought it necessary to modify the baptismal service, which he found would "not go down by any means in the strictness of our Liturgy". "I hope", he added, that "my Diocesan and the Honorable Society will not blame me in this so necessary a Condescension, in adding a word or two to soften that wch grates (as they say) upon tender consciences". No man was more naturally inclined than himself to observe the "Strictest Rules of the Rubrick", "but a part of St. Paul's pious Guile will sooner captivate these tempers than either the allurements of fair promises or the force of threats".[49] In 1708 Bishop Burnet was consulted on the same subject by Commissary Johnston of South Carolina, who observed that some of the clergy in his jurisdiction had been accustomed to give way to the extent of baptizing children without godparents and without the sign of the Cross. He was sure that Burnet would "say all that can be said on this argument; which is whether any of the Ceremonys [of] our Church may be dispensed, in order to preserve and retain those that are in communion with us already, tho' not such full Conformists as may be Wish'd for, and to gain those that do separate from us on the account of some Ceremonies and are actually joined and linked with the Dissenters".[50]

There was, however, a militant group, of whom John Talbot was perhaps the most conspicuous, who were so aggressive as to call

[47] Morris's "Memorial" in S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 1.
[48] S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 84.
[49] John Thomas, 1705, S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 102.
[50] *Ibid.*, A IV., no. 97.

forth protests even from Anglican officials. Governor Robert Hunter of New York and New Jersey was a vigorous supporter of authority in government and emphatic in his profession of loyalty to the Church of England as the "most pure and best constituted church upon earth"; he was also a subscriber to the society's funds. Nevertheless he thought there were fanatics in the church as well as out of it and that they were largely responsible for the political animosities in his neighborhood. He therefore repeatedly urged the society to send out a general letter to the missionaries advising them to be more cautious in their attitude "toward those of different Persuasions as to Ceremonial or Church Discipline".[51]

Some of the leading members of the society including the Archbishop of Canterbury himself sympathized, in a measure at least, with Hunter's view. Many of the bishops and some other church dignitaries had Whig affiliations and were not disposed to antagonize the dissenters unnecessarily. On one occasion the archbishop objected to the appointment of a certain missionary because of his pamphlet controversy with the Puritans, in which, Tenison thought, there was "too much bitterness for the Spirit of a Missionary".[52] At any rate the missionaries were cautioned as Hunter proposed and the Bishop of London agreed to use his influence with Talbot. To that sturdy fighter, Talbot, this prudent council seemed nothing less than a Laodicean plea for "moderation in religion" from men who lived "at home at ease and plenty", knowing little of colonial conditions and of the "damnable heresies" that flourished there. Toleration of such errors was "worse than the worst persecution in the World, for that only destroys men's bodys, but these destroy body and soul in Hell forever".[53]

In the main, however, the difference between Talbot and his more conciliatory associates and superiors was one of method rather than of principle. Both undoubtedly regarded the reclaiming of dis-

51 Letters of Hunter to the secretary of the society, February 21 to March 21, 1709/10, Letters Received, A V., nos. 70–73, 80. *Cf.* Journal, March 17, 1709/10; April 21, 1710.

52 Archbishop to the secretary, May 19, 1709/10. Letters Received, A V., no. 91; Journal, April 21, 1710. The Bishop of Norwich in his anniversary *Sermon* of 1709/10 warns against divisions in the society: "And to this end the Christianity given them to preach, should be kept as near as is possible to the Simplicity of the Gospel; and as free as may be from those Disputes which have been to the Hindrance of it. If all cannot be avoided by Reason of the Differences that are already on Foot among the Christians that live in those Parts, yet Care should be taken not to increase them; To be sure not to send any new Notions or Questions among them; which ought at least to be kept on this Side of the Water, if they cannot wholly be laid." *Sermon*, 1709/10, pp. 17–18.

53 Talbot to the secretary, S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 19.

senters as an important part of the missionary service.[54] The planting of Anglican churches in Puritan communities was held to be justified not simply because of doctrinal differences, but partly at least on the ground that many people in such communities failed to share in the fundamental sacraments of the Christian Church. In the correspondence of Caleb Heathcote, the New York politician, this point was urged as one of the chief reasons for the extension of the Anglican work to Connecticut. He maintained that the refusal of the Congregational ministers to baptize any children except those whose parents were in full communion left "many thousands in that Government unbaptized". In a subsequent letter he declared that in some of the Connecticut towns, less than one tenth of the "sober people" were "admitted to the sacrament". It seemed to him that those who "stop and hedge up the way to God's altar" would have much to answer for. From the Anglican point of view, which steadily emphasized the sacramental aspects of religion, such criticism was natural enough; for the Puritan theory conceived of the church as a carefully selected group of true believers, insisting on tests which limited membership and participation in the sacraments to a comparatively small part of the community.[55]

An interesting feature of the missionary correspondence related to Harvard College, whose importance as a training place for Puritan ministers was fully recognized. It was hoped, however, that instead of poisoning the minds of New England youth with the errors of Independency, Harvard might be converted into a centre of Anglican influence. In 1703 George Keith suggested that some "pious and able scholars" might be sent thither from Oxford and Cambridge to make disciples in the American Cambridge, who should in their turn gradually reclaim New England from its evil ways.[56] Nothing tangible came of this proposal, but it is an interesting anticipation of Timothy Cutler's defection from Congregational principles at Yale, twenty years later, and his subsequent efforts to secure the admission of the Anglican clergy of Boston to the Harvard Board of Overseers. Meantime, high hopes were entertained of persuading

[54] Cotton Mather complained in 1715 that the S. P. G. neglected many colonies "in the most paganizing Circumstances", sending their missionaries instead to towns where they could only serve as "Tools of Contention" and where "the meanest Christians understand Religion and practise it, better than the Ministers whom they send over to us". Mass. Hist. Soc. *Collections*, seventh series, VIII. 327.

[55] Heathcote's letters, 1706, 1710, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 165; A V., no. 84.

[56] Keith to Bray, February 26, 1702/3; *ibid.*, A I., no. 86. Cf. Talbot to the secretary, *ibid.*, no. 181.

many Harvard graduates to accept Anglican orders if only a resident bishop could be provided to give them ordination.[57]

As against the Quakers, the missionaries felt that they had an even stronger case. Talbot characterized them as "Anti-Christians who are worse than Turks" and if "let alone will increase to an abominable desolacion".[58] This intense feeling was due to a variety of causes. Something must be allowed for the influence of Keith's own experience as a recent convert from Quakerism, and the situation was complicated by the political objection to Quaker views on oaths and military service and their supposedly anarchical tendencies.[59] The very efficiency of their propaganda, on which Keith, especially, laid great stress, naturally increased the feeling against them.[60] Even a fragmentary reading of the Friends' records will show how thoroughly the London Yearly Meeting kept up its communications with the scattered Quaker communities in North America and the West Indies.[61] Their organization seems simple enough when compared with that of the Church of England, but it was indefatigable in the dissemination of literature and in the inspiring of volunteer missionaries for whom no journey was too difficult. Nor were they without influence in the imperial administration. Penn's position is well known, but it must not be forgotten that there were many other Friends among the well-to-do merchants of London whose standing as commercial experts gave them a decided advantage in pleading before the Board of Trade the cause of their brethren in the colonies who refused to pay "priest's rates" at the bidding of Anglican or Puritan authorities.[62] Indeed the Quaker "lobby" in London, if we may use a modern term, seemed at times quite able to hold its own even against the prelates of the national church.

Finally there was in the case of Quakerism, as well as in that of the Puritans, a fundamental question of principle, which helps to ex-

57 Heathcote to the society, *ibid.*, II., no. 117; Christopher Bridge to the secretary, October 7, 1706, *ibid.*, A III., no. 2; Memorial of S. Thomas, 1705, in S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 74. *Cf.* Quincy, *Hist. of Harvard Univ.*, I. 360–376, 560–574; Perry, *Hist. Coll. rel. to Amer. Col. Church*, III. 210 ff.

58 S. P. G. Letters Received, A III., no. 186.

59 The official attitude is illustrated by a representation of the Committee of Trade in 1694. *Acts of Privy Council, Colonial*, vol. II., no. 539. See Root, *The Relations of Pennsylvania with the British Government*, chs. VIII., IX., for a thorough treatment of political and legal issues.

60 Keith *et als.*, Account of the State, etc., S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 24. Keith to Bray, February 24, 1702/3, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 87.

61 Series of Epistles Received, Epistles Sent, in Friends' Historical Library, Devonshire House, London.

62 For typical procedure in such matters (1702), see London "Meeting for Sufferings", Minutes, XVI. 21–163, *passim*. *Cf.* Board of Trade Journal, September 3, 1702; January 25, 1702/3.

plain the intensity of ecclesiastical partizanship. Even more than the Puritan, the Quaker seemed to depart from the fundamental teachings of Christianity as understood by nearly all who in that age called themselves Christians at all. Some of their leaders, including Penn himself, were believed to be heterodox on the question of the Trinity;[63] and their doctrine of the "inner light", coupled with their indifference to the Christian sacraments, may well have seemed to be a mere cloak for irreligion. To a clergyman who conceived of the administration of the sacraments as the most sacred function of his office, the Quaker attitude was indeed a denial of the faith.[64]

Less prominent than the Puritans of Congregational or Presbyterian associations, and the Quakers, but still numerous enough to attract the attention of the missionaries, were the Baptists. They were most conspicuous in Rhode Island, but were by no means confined to that colony. In New Jersey, Lewis Morris was afraid that many of the new converts might be drawn away because of the encouragement given to the Anabaptist preachers by Andrew Browne, one of the councillors of that province.[65] In Pennsylvania, Keith had a public debate with a Baptist champion named Killingsworth, who had been summoned by his partizans for this purpose. The dispute lasted four hours, and as usual Keith believed that his arguments had been efficacious.[66] The Baptists were also to be found in the South. They are mentioned from time to time in the reports on several South Carolina parishes and in one parish they were said to form a majority of the dissenting inhabitants, with a preacher who

[63] Talbot writes: "It appears by Wm. Penn's Book that he is a greater Anti-Christ than Julian the Apostate." He credits Penn with saying that "Christ is a finite Impotent Creature". S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 119.

[64] The view of contemporary English churchmen on this subject is well illustrated by the petition of the London clergy against the Quakers' Affirmation Bill of 1722, protesting against further concessions "by a Christian legislature to a set of men who renounce the divine institutions of Christ, particularly that by which the faithful are initiated into his religion and denominated Christians, and who cannot on this account, according to the uniform judgment, and practice of the Catholic church, be deemed worthy of that sacred name". On the passage of the bill, several peers, spiritual and temporal, signed a protest referring to the Quakers as rejecting "the two sacraments of Christ" and consequently "as far as they so do, unworthy of the name of Christians". The protestants went on to express their opinion that "the Quakers, as they renounce the institutions of Christ, so have not given even the evidence by law required of their belief in his divinity". *Parliamentary History*, VII. 937–948. *Cf.* Barclay, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (tenth ed., London, 1841), chs. XII., XIII., for a good statement of the Quaker view that the formal observance of the sacraments was unnecessary. "For", he says, "we certainly know that the day is dawned in which God hath arisen and hath dismissed all those ceremonies and rites, and is only to be *worshipped in spirit*."

[65] S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 171.

[66] *Ibid.*, no. 87.

visited them every third Sunday. One such minister is mentioned as having lately arrived from the Devonshire town of Bideford.[67] Sometimes a missionary wrote home for literature in defense of infant baptism, and in 1705 the society at the instance of the Bishop of London considered a request from Chief Justice Trott of South Carolina, himself something of an expert in divinity, for the printing of five hundred copies of "John Philpot's Letter agst the Anabaptists". The matter was referred to a committee of which Archdeacon White Kennett, afterwards bishop of Peterborough, was a member. On their recommendation the letter was ordered to be printed accordingly, with extracts from the works of Bishop Stillingfleet.[68]

A somewhat different problem which confronted the Venerable Society and its missionaries was that of the foreign Protestants who were beginning to assume importance both at home and in the colonies. Here again ecclesiastical and political interests were clearly associated and the Church of England was felt to be a possible means of nationalizing the non-English stocks. It must be remembered in this connection that many churchmen even among the High Church party were disposed to differentiate quite sharply the Reformed churches of the Continent from the corresponding denominations in England which had refused to accept the authority of the national church. The latter were dissenters from a system which represented a preponderant opinion and had the support of the state. On the other hand the Lutherans and Calvinists of the Continent were conceded, by many Anglicans at least, a certain degree of legitimacy as the representatives of non-Roman Christianity in their respective countries.[69]

The letter-books of the society contain a considerable amount of correspondence with Continental clergy of the Reformed churches which in its distinctly irenic tone is fairly representative of an important section of Anglican opinion. Several of these foreign Protestants were elected members of the society, among them M. Bonet, the Prussian envoy in London, who served in 1709 on a committee to

[67] Report by S. Thomas in S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 79; Letters Received, A IV., nos. 111, 141, A V., no. 133.

[68] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 133; S. P. G. Journal, March 30, April 20, 1705.

[69] *Cf.* Overton, *Life in the English Church, 1660–1714*, pp. 348–351. The anniversary sermons in general show strong Protestant feeling. See the cordial references to the foreign Protestant members of the society in the Bishop of Norwich's *Sermon*, 1709/10, pp. 18, 22, and in the attached *Abstract*, p. 37. *Cf. Abstract* for 1712/3: "The Society have inlarg'd their correspondence in Foreign Courts and Universities, to communicate freely their Christian Designs, and to excite a Spirit of Zeal and Emulation in other Protestant States and Princes."

examine a candidate for missionary service among the German colonists.[70] There was an especially sympathetic attitude toward the French Protestant churches in England, whether, as in some instances, they accepted Anglican orders, or retained their own discipline.[71] With the great influx of Palatine Germans, however, a reaction set in and the Tory, High Church party displayed a strong antipathy toward the foreign immigrants.

In the missionary correspondence of this period three non-English elements figure most prominently: the French Huguenots, the Dutch, and the Germans. The French Huguenots presented on the whole the least difficulty. They were not massed in any one colony or group of colonies, but dispersed along the Atlantic seaboard from New England to South Carolina, where they played a more important part than in any other colony. In the French congregations the Calvinistic practice was at first generally maintained, but their relations with the Anglican element were usually amicable, notably so in South Carolina where these two groups acted together for some purposes against the English dissenters. Gideon Johnston, the commissary in South Carolina, reported that the French minister at Charleston had "greatly distinguished himself in favor of the Church of England against the dissenting ministers", and would "willingly receive Episcopal ordination", if he could conveniently go to England.[72] Efforts were made with some success to induce ministers and congregations to conform to the Anglican system, and in some cases the S. P. G. was willing to make grants of money on condition of such conformity. In Boston a French minister, whose ordination was regular, was nevertheless refused a subsidy because his congregation was not "conformable to the Church of England".[73] In 1706 the French minister at New Rochelle, in New York, was refused a regular allowance unless he and his congregation would use the English liturgy. Three years later this condition was complied with, though not without some friction.[74] To facilitate the change from the Reformed to the Anglican service the society interested itself in providing prayer-books in French and English.[75]

[70] S. P. G. Journal, I., *passim, e. g.,* December 17, 1708; December 16, 1709; March 3, 1709/10; also S. P. G. Letters Received, *passim.*

[71] *Cf.* Allen and McClure, *History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge,* pp. 19–21.

[72] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 158.

[73] S. P. G. Journal, March 21, 1706/7; Letters Received, A III., nos. 3, 4, 9.

[74] S. P. G. Journal, May 17, 1706; June 3, 1709; Letters Received, A IV., no. 155; A V., nos. 2, 135.

[75] Journal, November 18, December 2, 1709. *Cf.* annual *Sermon* and *Abstract* of 1710/11, p. 37, which notes the sending of "English and French Common Prayer Books to Carolina, New York, etc. this and the last year".

The problem of the Dutch in New York and New Jersey was more difficult. It was maintained by some that the fusion of Dutch and English elements should be promoted by gradually eliminating the Dutch ministers and substituting Anglican clergy. The notorious Lord Cornbury proposed that, as the Dutch ministers died, their places should be filled with English ministers; and one of the missionaries quoted him as saying that even "without a command, if the Queen would only give him leave he would never suffer another Dutch minister to come in". Without such drastic measures he despaired of making New York a truly English colony.[76] Cornbury's view did not prevail, however, and more moderate measures were adopted. In 1704 Lewis Morris urged that a "vast service" would be done if a Dutchman, or at least someone acquainted with the Dutch language could be sent as a missionary to New York with a "Parcell of Dutch Common Prayer Books to give away",[77] and this policy was actually pursued to a limited extent, as in the case of the French. In 1710 a Dutch clergyman, after being duly ordained by the Bishop of London, was appointed missionary to Harlem with the usual allowance from the society;[78] and there are frequent votes in the Journal for the sending out of Dutch prayer-books.[79] A little later Morris reported that the new missionary was gaining ground at Harlem, and that there were already "several Strenuous Dutch advocates for the Church", though he agreed that substantial progress would "be a work of time".[80]

The spiritual care of the German immigrants became a matter of serious concern to the society in 1709. Even a year earlier the Board of Trade had before it an application from Joshua von Kocherthal for a salary to be settled upon him on his arrival in New York, and there was some doubt as to a precedent for such a grant to a foreign clergyman.[81] In May, 1709, a committee of the society reported on a proposal recently received that a German minister be sent out with the Palatines. The committee suggested that if

[76] T. Moor to the secretary, November 13, 1705, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 122; Cornbury to the same, November 22, 1705, *ibid.*, no. 131.

[77] *Ibid.*, A I., no. 171.

[78] Journal, December 16, 30, 1709; January 20, February 3, 10, 1709/10; Letters Received, A V., no. 143.

[79] Journal, March 28, 1706; November, December, 1709; April 28, 1710. The *Abstract* for 1710/11 (pp. 37–38) notes the printing of 750 copies of the liturgy in "English and Low Dutch".

[80] Letters Received, A V., no. 143. The mission was withdrawn in 1713. Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, p. 61.

[81] Board of Trade Journal, July 8, 1708. Kocherthal was afterwards voted £20 by the society, though his failure to secure Episcopal ordination prevented his being adopted as a regular missionary.

no suitable person could be found in England, application might be made to "Professor Frank at Hall in Germany".[82] After conference with the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury, action was postponed until the government had decided what was to be done about the transportation of refugees to America. In December the subject was reopened and La Mothe, a French refugee minister, was requested, with one other member, to select a suitable person for the service. A few weeks later, the society after hearing from the committee voted to appoint John Frederic Hager, a German minister who had presented satisfactory testimonials, provided he would accept Episcopal ordination and qualify under the usual rules for the missionary service. These conditions were complied with and in a few months Hager began his service in New York.[83]

The new minister had, however, a complex situation to deal with, partly because the German Protestants were themselves divided into Calvinistic and Lutheran factions. Though Hager reported a considerable number of German communicants, they seem to have acted under some sense of compulsion. The Lutheran minister was said to have urged his people to "stick to that in which they were bred and born", and Hager's efforts to compel their conformity were discouraged even by so good a churchman as Morris. The Calvinists, thereupon, began to ask, "If the Lutherans are not obliged to conform, why should we?"[84] Thus with the Germans as with the Dutch, the difficulties were great and the results inconsiderable. As is well known, the Palatines were not happy in New York and the main stream of German immigration was deflected to Pennsylvania, where they were left to work out their own salvation with less interference.

The vigorous competition of all these rival churches brought out

[82] The distinguished pietist theologian, Francke, is doubtless referred to here. *Cf.* Allen and McClure, *History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, p. 21.

[83] S. P. G. Journal, May 20, June 3, December 2, 16, 30, 1709; S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 143. The annual *Abstract* of 1710/11 (p. 38) records the appointment of a minister among the "Poor Palatines" of New York and declares the intention of the society to "give them a whole Impression of our Liturgy in the High Dutch or German Tongue, which as they are inform'd from thence, is like to be a happy Expedient of uniting both Lutherans and Calvinists and bringing them all over to the Church of England".

[84] Hager to the secretary, S. P. G. Letters Received, A VI., nos. 21, 44; Lewis Morris to the secretary, *ibid.*, A V., no. 143. Kocherthal wrote from New York in November, 1710, that he had sounded the Lutheran Palatines as to their possible union with the Church of England "in ceremonialibus", adding, "finde aber das es bey den meisten sehr hart solte hergehen; nichtsdestoweniger hoffe ich nach und nach sie dahin zu persuadiren". *Ibid.*, VI., no. 45.

clearly the weakness of the Anglican organization on the colonial side. In characteristic and picturesque language, John Talbot put his finger on the weak point. "The Presbyterians", he said, "come a long way to lay hands on one another. . . . The Independents are called by their Sovereign Lord the People. The Anabaptists and Quakers pretend to the Spirit. But the poor Church has nobody on the spot to comfort or confirm her children. Nobody to ordain several that are willing to serve were they ordained for the work of the ministry."[85] In short the Anglican Church in America was trying to operate a system in which the episcopal function was essential, with no bishop nearer than three thousand miles away. Confirmation was the normal condition of full communion and ordination was essential to the full exercise of the clerical function, yet neither confirmation nor ordination could be exercised by any one in America.[86]

The discipline of the clergy presented another serious difficulty. The lack of a competent ecclesiastical jurisdiction for this purpose naturally led colonial governors and assemblies into the institution of other methods which, from an Anglican point of view, were decidedly irregular. In South Carolina, for example, even the zealous church party became involved in a controversy with the Bishop of London on this question. Royal governors and other imperial officials, however sound their churchmanship might be, were hardly competent supervisors of the clergy; but the society felt obliged to use them in this capacity. The missionaries, thus subjected, as one of them truly said, "to the various humors of different overseers", were tempted "to be Parasites, fawn, and stroke that which may hurt us".[87] Some of the most serious conflicts of the colonial clergy were with men like Nicholson, Cornbury, and Quary, who had acquired prestige as zealous supporters of the church.[88]

[85] Letter of September 1, 1703, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A I.

[86] *Cf.* a letter from J. Bass of New Jersey to the secretary, September 2, 1709, in which he refers specifically to the difficulty arising from the rubric requiring confirmation before communion. *Ibid.*, A V., no. 43.

[87] J. Thomas to Hodges, April 30, 1709, in *ibid.*, A V., no. 17.

[88] The difficulties between Governor Nicholson of Virginia and James Blair are well known. Cornbury was at first in high favor with the missionaries, but as one of them wrote later, "Tempora mutantur", and his harsh treatment of the New Jersey clergymen was used to prove the need of a resident bishop. *Ibid.*, A III., no. 168. Quary complained of the factious attitude of "these Young Gentlemen of the Clergy" who desired to "govern as they please without the least control". Quary's feelings were evidently reciprocated, for one of the clergy wrote that he lacked "time to set forth the sinister ends of this person to which he would make the Church and the Ministers subservient, of whom he always endeavored to form a party to joyn him in his representation of himself and the establishment of his character at home", Thomas Jenkins to the secretary, March 23, 1708. *Ibid.*, A IV., no. 110.

The missionaries on the ground and the society at home were substantially agreed as to the need of a resident bishop. Undoubtedly the proposal had important political bearings. It was urged by some of its promoters that an American bishop would help to support authority against factious elements in the colonial governments, and the close relation between the Anglican clergy and the leaders of the imperialistic party is a well-known fact of colonial politics.[89] The experience of many Englishmen who had come to America had undoubtedly been such as to suggest that an American bishop once securely established would hardly content himself with the spiritual care of his own flock. As White Kennett said in a letter to Colman in 1713, there was "so much of an *Ecclesiastical* and of a *Civil* Nature in this Affair" as to make the solution extremely difficult. Nevertheless the hearty support given to the measure by liberal churchmen like Kennett and Tenison indicates that the genuinely religious motive deserves more emphasis than has commonly been allowed by students of American history. The plan cannot fairly be set down as a purely Tory proposition.[90]

In order to disarm possible opponents, it was suggested by Bishop Compton and others that instead of appointing at the outset a bishop of full rank, a suffragan bishop might be sent out with delegated authority to perform such functions as confirmation and ordination, but without the full powers of an English diocesan.[91] The whole subject was seriously considered by a committee of the society in 1703 and the Journal contains numerous references to the subject during the next ten years.[92] There were legal difficulties in the way which delayed action but in 1707 Archbishop Tenison reported that he had laid the matter before the queen, and that she had asked him to prepare a plan.[93] Two years later the matter was again discussed at a meeting attended by the archbishop himself; and in 1710 the society took advantage of public interest in the Iroquois mission to point out the difficulty of administering such work without a bishop.[94] Finally, in the last years of Queen Anne's reign, the plan of an American episcopate seemed likely to come in

[89] Address of clergy at Burlington, N. J., November 2, 1705, in S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 84.

[90] *Cf.* Cross, *Anglican Episcopate,* pp. 93–99, especially 99, notes. See also chs. VII., VIII.

[91] *Ibid.,* app. A, no. III., pp. 277–278.

[92] *E. g.,* April 16, 1703; November 17, December 15, 1704; December, 1706–October, 1707, *passim*; app. A, no. 50.

[93] *Ibid.,* September 19, 1707.

[94] The annual *Abstract* for 1710/11 reports (p. 36) that the matter is "yet depending before the Society" and that in the meantime Gov. Hunter was authorized to treat for the purchase of a bishop's house at Burlington.

with the rising tide of High Church influence in the national councils. In 1713 it was expected that a bill would be presented to Parliament authorizing the creation of the new bishoprics.[95] The next year, however, Queen Anne died, the Tories went out of office, and the opportunity for establishing an effective organization of the colonial church was indefinitely postponed.[96]

Just what would have been the effect of extending the diocesan system to the colonies, half a century before the economic and political controversies of the Revolutionary era, it is, of course, quite impossible to say. The work of the Venerable Society went on and substantial results were accomplished. Nevertheless it can hardly be doubted that the establishment of the national church, in anything like its full vigor, on American soil would have strengthened materially the influence of traditional and conservative ideals. The comparative weakness of the Anglican Church was significant, not merely because its clergy were advocates of certain political theories;[97] but perhaps even more because their whole system of worship and discipline emphasized the importance for each new generation of the inherited elements in civilization, or, to use Burke's phrase again, the "early received and uniformly continued sense of mankind". A lessened sense of the dignity and value of this continuous tradition, attaching the new-world life to its roots in the old, was surely one important element in that differentiation of American from European society which found political expression in a new nationality.

EVARTS B. GREENE.

[95] An address by the society to the queen recommended four colonial bishops. *Ibid.*, 1713/14, p. 39.

[96] See Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, pp. 100, 101, in which the controversies resulting from the later revival of the plan are fully discussed. There are still hopeful references to the project in the annual *Abstracts* of 1714/15 (pp. 52–55) and 1715/16 (pp. 21–22). The latter records Archbishop Tenison's bequest of £1000 "toward the Settlement of Two Bishops, one for the Continent, the other for the Isles of America".

[97] *Cf.* Van Tyne, "Influence of the Clergy, and of Religious and Sectarian Forces on the American Revolution", in AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIX. 44–64 (1913).

THE CREATIVE FORCES IN WESTWARD EXPANSION: HENDERSON AND BOONE[1]

As focus of the old West, Kentucky has always loomed large in the national imagination as the habitat of the American border hero. Boone and Kenton, Harrod and Clark, Callaway and Logan, lurk vast in the wings of the national theatre, dramatic protagonists magnified to almost superhuman proportions in the mist of a legendary past. About them floats the aureole of traditional romance. Wrought with rude but masterly strength out of the hardships and vicissitudes of pioneer life, the heroic conquest of the wilderness, the mortal struggles of border warfare, this composite figure of Indian fighter, crafty backwoodsman, and crude surveyor has emerged as the type-figure in the romance of the evolution of American character. This model, with its invincible fascination and predominantly heroic attributes, has overshadowed and obscured the less spectacular yet more fecund instrumentalities in the colonization and civilization of the West. To-day, in the clarifying light of contemporary research, illuminating social and economic forces, the creative and formative causes of colonization and expansion, the individual merges into the group; and the isolated effort assumes its true character as merely a single factor in social evolution. We have come to recognize that the man of genius obeys a movement quite as much as he controls it, and even more than he creates it. In the pitiless perspective of historic evolution, the spectacular hero at first sight seems to lessen; but the mass, the movement, the social force which he epitomizes and interprets, gain in impressiveness and dignity.[2]

The hero of the pioneer West, Daniel Boone, has played the lofty rôle of exemplar of the leadership of the *hinterland* movement of the eighteenth century. At the hands of that inaccurate and turgid amanuensis, John Filson, Boone has been apotheosized, in approved Scriptural fashion, as the instrument of Providence, ordained by God to settle the wilderness. Nor is this superstitious delusion confined to Filson. "An over-ruling Providence", says Boone, in speaking of himself, "seems to have watched over his life, and preserved

[1] A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association at Charleston, December 30, 1913.

[2] *Cf.* Henderson, "The Beginnings of American Expansion", *North Carolina Review*, September and October, 1910.

him to be the humble instrument in settling one of the fairest portions of the new world."[3] Fancy has played erratically about this sane and simple figure, envisaging him in countless disguises, from the primitive man returning to nature (after Rousseau) to the genius of modern communism (after Spencer). At the hands of the earlier biographers, Boone has taken on the hue and tone of an unsocial and primitive figure, as unreal as an Indian from the pages of Chateaubriand, perpetually fleeing from civilization in response to the lure of the forest and the irresistible call of the wild. At the hands of later biographers, Boone is fantastically endowed with the creative imagination of the colonizer and the civic genius of a founder of states. In the face of such disparities of romantic distortion, wrought upon the character and rôle of Boone, the true significance of the westward expansionist movement suffers obscuration and eclipse. Scientifically historic investigation must relegate to the superstitious and the gullible, to the panegyrist and the hero-worshipper, the providential interpretation of our national history.

Meantime, there remains to narrate the just and authentic story of westward expansion, and to project the true picture of Boone as the typical figure of the expert backwoodsman in the westward migration of the peoples. Only thus shall we secure the correct perspective for the social, political, and economic history of the colonization of the West. Such a recital must unmask the forces behind Boone, the chain of social causation, the truly creative forces in the expansionist movement. In such a recital, Boone is shorn of none of those remarkable powers as explorer, scout, pathfinder, landlooker, and individual Indian fighter which have given him a secure niche in the hall of national fame. It involves the recognition, nevertheless, that his genius was essentially individual rather than social, unique rather than communistic. In the larger social sense, it involves the further recognition that those of Boone's achievements which had the widest bearing on the future and ultimately effected national results were accomplished through his instrumentality, not in the rôle of originative genius and constructive colonizer, but in the rôle of pioneer and way-breaker. Boone's pioneering initiative and his familiarity with Indian temperament found the best field for their most effective display under the guidance of the constructive mind and colonizing genius of Henderson. Boone acted as the agent of men of commercial enterprise and far-seeing political imagination, intent upon an epochal politico-economic project of colonization, promotion, and expansion. Boone may have been the instrument of

[3] Memorial to the Legislature of Kentucky", January 18, 1812.

Providence, as he so piously imagined; but it is indubitable that he was the agent of commercial enterprise and colonial promotion.

I.

The exploration and colonization of the West, with the ultimate consequence of the acquisition of the trans-Alleghany region, was not the divinely appointed work of any single man. In reality, this consummation flowered out of two fundamental impulses in the life of the period, the creative causes of territorial expansion. Intensive analysis reveals the further cardinal fact that it was two racial streams, the one distinguished by unit-characters, individualistic, democratic, the other corporate in interests, communistic, with aristocratic attributes—their temporary co-ordination and subsequent sharp mutual reaction—which constituted the instrumentalities for the initial steps in the westward expansionist movement. The creative forces which inaugurated the territorial expansion of the American people westward found typical embodiment, the one in a great land company intent upon carving out a new colony, the other in the supreme pioneer and land-looker of his day.

The prime determinative principle of the progressive American civilization of the eighteenth century was the passion for the acquisition of land. After the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748), which left the boundaries of France and England in America unsettled, Céloron de Bienville was despatched in the spring of 1749 to sow broadcast the seeds of empire, the leaden plates symbolic of the asserted sovereignty of France. Through a grant to the Ohio Company, organized in 1748 and composed of a number of the most prominent men of the day in Virginia, England proceeded to take possession without the formal assertion of her claims; and Christopher Gist, summoned from his remote home on the Yadkin in North Carolina, made a thorough reconnaissance of the western region in 1750–1751. Almost simultaneously, the Loyal Land Company of Virginia received a royal grant of eight hundred thousand acres, and in the spring of 1750 despatched Thomas Walker westward upon his now well-known tour of exploration.[4] The vast extent of uninhabited transmontane lands, of fabled beauty, richness, and fertility, excited dreams of grandiose possibilities in the minds of English and colonials alike. England was said to be "New Land mad and everybody there has his eye fixed on this Country".[5] To Franklin and Washington, to the Lees and Patrick Henry, to Lyman and Clark, the West

[4] J. S. Johnston, *First Explorations of Kentucky* (Filson Club Publications).
[5] Johnson MSS., XII., no. 127.

loomed large as the promised land—for settlement, for trade, for occupation—to men brave enough to risk their all in its acquisition. The royal proclamation of 1763 gave a new impetus to the colonizing spirit, dormant during the early years of the war, and marks the true beginning of Western colonization. The feeling of the period was succinctly interpreted by Washington, who, in describing the "rising empire" beyond the Alleghanies, denominates it "a tract of country which is unfolding to our view, the advantages of which are too great and too obvious, I should think, to become the subject of serious debate, but which, through ill-timed parsimony and supineness, may be wrested from us and conducted through other channels".[6]

The second determinative impulse of the pioneer civilization was *wanderlust*—the passionately inquisitive instinct of the hunter, the traveller, the explorer. A secondary object of the proclamation of 1763, according to Edmund Burke, was the limitation of the colonies on the West, as "the charters of many of our old colonies give them, with few exceptions, no bounds to the westward but the South Sea".[7] The Long Hunters taking their lives in their hands fared boldly forth to a fabled hunters' paradise in the far-away wilderness, because they were driven by the irresistible desire of a Ponce de Leon or a De Soto, a Stanley or a Peary, to discover the truth about the undiscovered lands beyond the mountains. The hunter was not only thrilled with the passion of the chase in a veritable paradise of game: he was intent upon collecting the furs and skins of wild animals for lucrative barter and sale in the centres of trade. Quick to make "tomahawk claims" and to assert "corn rights", the pioneer spied out the rich virgin lands for future location, there to be free from the vexatious insistence of the tax-gatherer. "The people at the back part of those [North Carolina and Virginia] and the neighboring Colonies", writes Dunmore to Hillsborough as late as 1772, "finding that grants are not to be obtained, do seat themselves without any formalities wherever they like best."[8] To exploit the land for his individual advantage, eventually to convert the wilderness to the inevitable uses and purposes of civilization: such was the mission of the pioneer. Acting-Governor Nelson of Virginia, referring in 1770 to the frontier settlements, significantly remarks: "Very little if any Quit Rents have been received for his majesty's use from that Quarter for some time past; for they [the settlers] say, that as His

[6] *Cf.* Hulbert, *Washington and the West.*

[7] *Annual Register*, 1763, p. 20.

[8] "State Paper Office, America, vol. 192, no. 7", is the reference attached to the transcript in the Virginia State Library, Aspinwall Collection, pp. 77–81. Presumably the modern reference to the original is, Public Record Office, C. O. 5: 989.

Majesty hath been pleased to withdraw his protection from them since 1763, they think themselves bound not to pay Quit Rents."[9] The axe and the surveyor's chain, along with the rifle and the hunting-knife, constituted the armorial bearings of the pioneer. Again, with individual as with corporation, with explorer as with landlord, land-hunger was the master-impulse of the era.

In a little hamlet in North Carolina in the middle years of the eighteenth century, these two determinative principles, the acquisitive and the inquisitive instincts, found a conjunction which may justly be termed prophetic. Here occurred the meeting of two streams of racial tendency. The exploratory passion of the pioneer, given directive force in the interest of commercial enterprise, prepared the way for the westward migration of the peoples. That irresistible Southern migration, which preceded and presaged the greater wandering of the peoples across the Alleghanies a quarter of a century later, brought a horde of pioneer settlers from the more thickly populated sections of Pennsylvania, and a group of gentlemen planters from the Old Dominion of Virginia, to the frontier colony of North Carolina—famed afar for her fertile farm lands, alluvial river bottoms, and rich hunting grounds. The migratory horde from Pennsylvania found ultimate lodgment for certain of its number in the frontier county of Rowan; the stream of gentlemen planters from Virginia came to rest in the more settled regions of Orange and Granville. From these two racial and social elements stem the fecund creative forces in westward expansion.[10]

II.

In the first half of the eighteenth century, Pennsylvania felt the impetus of civilization from the throngs of immigrants who flocked into the Neshaminy Valley, the Cumberland Valley, eastward to the Delaware, up the river to the Lehigh, and into the twilight zone

[9] Nelson to Hillsborough, October 18, 1770. Bancroft Transcripts, Library of Congress.

[10] In the history of this epochal movement there is one of the most singular of *lacunae*—a gap almost unprecedented in a period of American life so industriously studied. Close scrutiny of the Draper collection, generally presumed to be the court of last resort for the career of Boone, as well as of Draper's correspondence, reveals the significant fact that the voluminous records of Rowan, where Boone lived for a quarter of a century prior to his removal to Kentucky, eluded the watchful eye, if not the curiosity, of the indefatigable Draper. An intensive study of these county records, the Draper MSS., the Henderson, Burton, Hogg, Hart, and Benton papers, taken in conjunction with a wider research into the careers of Daniel Boone and Richard Henderson, made by the writer, effects a new distribution of perspective and affords a rational *exposé* of the early expansionist movement.

of uncertain title towards Maryland. "These bold and indigent strangers", says Logan, Penn's agent, in 1724, "gave as their excuse when challenged for titles that we had solicited for colonists and they had come accordingly."[11] Aside from these bold squatters, who asserted that "it was against the laws of God and nature that so much land should be idle while so many christians wanted it to work on and to raise their bread", came innumerable *bona fide* purchasers of land, fleeing from the traditional bonds of caste and aristocracy in England and Europe, from religious persecution and favoritism, to a haven of refuge, where they received guarantees of full tolerance in religious faith and the benefits of representative self-government. From East Devonshire in England came George, the grandfather of Daniel Boone, and from Wales came Edward Morgan, whose daughter Sarah married Squire, Daniel Boone's father—conspicuous representatives of the Society of Friends, drawn thither by the representations of the great Quaker, William Penn, with his advanced views on popular government and religious toleration.[12] Hither too came Morgan Bryan from Ireland, where he had gone from Denmark, settling in Chester County prior to 1719; and his children, William, James, and Morgan, the brothers-in-law of Daniel Boone, were intimately concerned in the subsequent westward migration.[13] In 1720 the vanguard of that great army of Ulster Scots, with their stern, rugged qualities of aggressive self-reliance, appeared in Pennsylvania. In September, 1734, Michael Finley from County Armagh, Ireland, presumably accompanied by his brother Archibald, landed in Philadelphia; and this Archibald Finley, a settler in Bucks County, according to the best authorities was the father of John Finley or Findley or Findlay, Boone's guide and companion in his famous exploration of Kentucky in 1769–1771.[14] Hither too came Mordecai Lincoln, great-grandson of Samuel Lincoln, who had emigrated from England to Hingham, Massachusetts, as early as 1637;

11 Hanna, *Scotch-Irish*, II. 60, 63.

12 George Boone, with his wife, emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1717; and his son George, on his arrival, produced a certificate from Bradnich meeting in Devonshire. Edward Morgan was a member of Gwynedd monthly meeting. *Cf.* Original Minutes of Abington and Gwynedd Monthly Meetings, Pa.

13 *Cf. Bryan's Station* (Filson Club Publications, no. 12); also W. S. Ely, *The American Ararat* (Publications of the Bucks County, Pa., Historical Society); MS. History of the Bryan Family, owned by Col. W. L. Bryan, Boone, N. C.

14 Ely, *The Finleys of Bucks* (Publications of the Bucks County, Pa., Historical Society); also Ely, "Historic Associations of Neshaminy Valley", *Daily Intelligencer* (Reading, Pa.), July 29, 1913. While Archibald, the father, spelled the surname Finley, it appears from an autograph in the possession of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, Draper MSS., 2 B 161, that the explorer spelled it Findlay.

and this Mordecai, who in 1720 settled in Chester County, Pennsylvania, was the father of Sarah Lincoln, who married William Boone, and of Abraham Lincoln, who married Anne Boone, William's first cousin.[15] Early settlers in Pennsylvania were members of the Hanks family, one of the descendants being Abraham Hanks, grandfather of the Abraham Hanks of Prince William County, Virginia, who accompanied William Calk on his journey with Richard Henderson over Boone's trail in 1775.[16]

The rising scale of prices for Pennsylvania lands, changing from ten pounds per hundred acres and two shillings quit-rents in 1719 to fifteen and a half pounds per hundred acres with a quit-rent of a half-penny per acre in 1732, soon turned the eyes of the settlers southward in the direction of new and cheaper lands, the prices for which decreased in inverse ratio to their distance from Pennsylvania. In Maryland, in 1738, lands were offered at five pounds sterling per hundred acres. Simultaneously, in the valley of Virginia, free grants of a thousand acres per family were being made; and in the Piedmont region of North Carolina, the proprietary of Lord Granville through his agents was disposing of the most desirable lands to settlers at the rate of three shillings proclamation money for six hundred and forty acres, the unit of land division, and was also making large free grants on the condition of seating a certain proportion of settlers. The rich lure of these cheap and even free lands set up a vast migration southward from Pennsylvania in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. In 1734 the Bryans migrated to Virginia, obtaining a grant near Winchester, whence they removed to the Forks of the Yadkin in North Carolina about 1750.[17] In 1750 the Boones, soon followed by the Hanks and Lincoln families, migrated southward to Virginia; and shortly afterwards, Squire Boone, sr., with his family settled at the Forks of the Yadkin in Rowan County. From 1740 there was a ceaseless tide of immigration into the valley of the Yadkin, of the Scotch-Irish and Quakers from Pennsylvania. In a letter to the Secretary of the Board of Trade from Edenton, North Carolina (Feb. 15, 1750/1),

[15] Mordecai Lincoln was the great-great-grandfather of President Lincoln. There was another connection between the Boone and Lincoln families: Mary Lincoln, daughter of Abraham Lincoln (1736–1806) and Anne Boone Lincoln, married a Joseph Boone. For data concerning the Boone and Lincoln families, I am indebted to Mr. Andrew Shaaber, the librarian of the Historical Society of Berks County, Pa. *Cf.*, also, *The Early Life of Abraham Lincoln*, by Tarbell and Davis.

[16] The original manuscript diary of William Calk is now in the possession of one of his descendants, who permitted me to examine it. William Calk's companion, Abraham Hanks, was the maternal grandfather of President Lincoln.

[17] Kercheval, *History of the Valley of Virginia.*

Governor Gabriel Johnston says, "Inhabitants flock in here daily, mostly from Pensilvania and other parts of America, who are overstocked with people and some directly from Europe, they commonly seat themselves towards the West and have got near the mountains." Writing from the same town on September 12, 1752, Bishop Spangenburg of the Moravian Church says that a considerable number of the inhabitants of North Carolina have settled here "as they wished to own land and were too poor to buy in Pennsylvania or New Jersey"; and in 1753 he observes that "even in this year more than 400 families with horse wagons and cattle have migrated to this State. . . ."[18] The immensity of this mobile, drifting mass is demonstrated by the statement of Governor William Tryon that in the summer and winter of 1765 "upwards of one thousand wagons passed thro' Salisbury with families from the northward, to settle in this province chiefly".

This southward-moving wave of migration, predominantly Scotch-Irish and English, with an admixture of a Welsh element, starting from Pennsylvania in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, swept through Maryland, and in the middle years of the century inundated the valley of Virginia and the Piedmont region of North Carolina. About Salisbury, the county seat of Rowan, now rapidly formed a settlement of people marked by strong individuality, sturdy independence, and virile self-reliance. The immigrants, following the course of the Great Trading Path, did not stop at Salisbury but radiated thence in all directions. The Morgans, Quakers and Baptists, remained in Pennsylvania, spreading over Philadelphia and Bucks counties; the Hanks and Lincoln stocks found refuge in Virginia; but the Boones and the Bryans founded their settlement at the Forks of the Yadkin. A few miles distant was the tiny hamlet of Salisbury, consisting of seven or eight log houses and the courthouse (1755).[19] The Boones and the Bryans, quickly accommodating themselves to frontier conditions much ruder and more primitive than those of their Pennsylvania home, immediately began to take an active part in the local affairs of the county.[20] The Boones quickly transferred their allegiance from the Society of Friends to the Baptist Church, worshipping at the Boone's Ford Church on the Davie side of the Yadkin; the Bryans, on the other hand, moved perhaps by the eloquence of the gentle Asbury, who often visited them, adopted Methodist principles.[21] In this region infested with

[18] For these several statements, *cf. N. C. Col. Rec.*, IV. 1073, 1312; VII. 249.

[19] *N. C. Col. Rec.*, V. 355 *et seq.*

[20] Squire Boone, shortly after his arrival in the neighborhood, was chosen justice of the peace; and Morgan Bryan was soon appearing as foreman of juries and director in road improvements in the county.

[21] Says the Rev. Francis Asbury in his *Journal*, in speaking of his frontier congregations: "In every place the congregations were large, and received the

Cherokee and Catawba Indians, Captain Anthony Hampton with his company of rangers actively patrolled the frontier; and Daniel Boone won his spurs as a soldier under the sagacious Indian fighter, commander of Fort Dobbs, Hugh Waddell.[22] Through the wilderness to the westward, across the mountains, and into the valley of the Holston, the nomadic Boone roamed at will, spying out the land, and hunting and trapping to his heart's content. In such an environment was bred the Pennsylvanian, Daniel Boone, of Quaker stock, with Baptist proclivities. Humble in origin but strongly marked in his individual democracy, Boone learned the stern frontier lessons of frugality, self-repression, and self-reliance. Here he tasted the sweets of freedom and developed the roving instinct which later marked him out as the supreme pioneer of his time. Chafing under the hampering restrictions of community life and realizing himself to be unsuited to the monotonous routine of farming, he was irresistibly impelled by his own nomadic temperament to seek the wider liberty of the wilderness. It is measurably more than surmise to say that he sought wider fields in the vague hope of enjoying there a larger degree of individual freedom under the impulse of pioneer democracy. Virginia and Pennsylvania contributed liberally to the formation of the national character in the cradle of the West. At this precise moment in history was to emerge, out of North Carolina, after a sojourn of a quarter of a century, the incarnation of the individual democracy which afterwards was to exert such a profound effect upon the development of American civilization, and to produce in time an Andrew Jackson and an Abraham Lincoln.[23]

III.

Simultaneous with the streaming of the peasant Quakers and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians into the Piedmont region of North Caro-

word with all readiness of mind. I know not that I have spent such a week since I came to America. I saw everywhere such a simplicity in the people, with such a vehement thirst after the word of God, that I frequently preached and continued in prayer till I was hardly able to stand" (I. 174). *Cf.* also Sheets, *History of Liberty Baptist Association,* and J. T. Alderman, *The Baptists at the Forks of the Yadkin* (Baptist Historical Papers).

[22] Archibald D. Murphey, "Indian Nations of North Carolina", MSS. Collections, N. C. Historical Commission. *Cf.* also Alfred Moore Waddell, *A Colonial Officer and his Times*; and Draper's manuscript Life of Boone.

[23] *Cf.* Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History", *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association, 1893. In this same frontier environment which shaped the Boones and the Bryans, was born a few years later Andrew Jackson; and Mr. William Jennings Bryan is descended from a brother of the Bryan whose daughter was married to Daniel Boone.

lina,[24] having as consequence the gradual evolution of the embryonic forms of pioneer American democracy, was proceeding another movement into the counties of Orange and Granville, of families of quality and superior position, destined to exert in equally distinctive ways an ineffaceable impress upon the development of the West. In the middle years of the eighteenth century, attracted by the lure of rich and cheap lands, many families of Virginia gentry, principally from Hanover County, settled in the region ranging from Williamsborough on the east to Hillsborough on the west. Hither came the Hendersons, the Bullocks, the Williamses, the Harts, the Lewises, the Taylors, the Bentons, the Penns, the Burtons, the Hares, and the Sneeds.[25] There soon arose in this section of the colony a society marked by intellectual distinction, social graces, and the leisured dignity of the landlord and the large planter. Here was forming a new society, constituting the social link between the wealthy and predominant aristocracy in the East and the rude frontier democracy in the West. A similar type of society, that of Piedmont Virginia, produced such champions of the new democracy as Jefferson and Patrick Henry—a society composite of independent yeoman and their leaders, the large planters. It was sharply differentiated from the colonial society of the coast, being inherently democratic in instinct and aristocratic in tone. "Never scarcely in England have I seen more beautiful prospects", writes James Iredell in testimony of the beauty of the lands of Granville,[26] and its richness and productivity as agricultural and grazing land were demonstrated by the yield of great crops of Indian corn and other grain, and the vast droves of cattle and hogs. So conspicuous for means, intellect, culture, and refinement were the people of this social group—a people with "abundance of wealth and leisure for enjoyment", says the quaint old diarist, Hugh McAden[27]—that Governor Josiah Martin, passing through Granville and Bute counties on his way from Hillsborough in 1772, significantly remarks: "They have great pre-eminence, as well with respect to soil and cultivation, as

[24] S. B. Weeks, *Southern Quakers and Slavery*; also *William and Mary College Quarterly*, XII. 129–134; Henderson, *Life and Times of Richard Henderson*; *Biographical Hist. of N. C.*

[25] W. H. Battle, "Memoir of Chief Justice Leonard Henderson", *N. C. Univ. Mag.*, November, 1859; T. B. Kingsbury, "Chief Justice Leonard Henderson", *Wake Forest Student*, November, 1898; R. W. Winston, "Leonard Henderson", Frank Nash, "Hillsborough, Colonial and Revolutionary", Nash, "History of Orange County", *N. C. Booklet*. The author has also had the privilege of examining the valuable collection of Hart-Benton MSS., kindly placed at his disposal by Miss Lucretia Hart Clay, of Lexington, Ky.

[26] McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, I. 434.

[27] Foote, *Sketches of N. C.*

to the manners and condition of the inhabitants, in which last respect the difference is so great that one would be led to think them people of another region."[28] From this society came such eminent democratic figures as the father-in-law and preceptor of Henry Clay, Thomas Hart; his grandson, the "Old Bullion" and "Great Pacificator" of a later era, Thomas Hart Benton; Richard Henderson, president of the colony of Transylvania, known to his contemporaries as the "Patrick Henry of North Carolina"; John Penn, signer of the Declaration of Independence; William Kennon, eloquent advocate of the Mecklenburg Resolves of May 31, 1775; and others almost equally distinguished. Like the society of the Virginia Piedmont, it was, to employ the words of Turner, "a society naturally expansive, seeing its opportunity to deal in unoccupied lands along the frontier which continually moved toward the West, and in this era of the eighteenth century dominated by the democratic ideals of pioneers rather than by the aristocratic tendencies of slave-holding planters".[29] From the cross-fertilization of this society of gentry, of innate qualities of leadership, democratic instincts, economic cast, and expansive tendencies, with the primitive, pioneer society of the frontier, frugal in taste, responsive to leadership, ready and thorough in execution, there was evolved the militant expansive movement in American life. Out of the ancient breeding-ground of North Carolina, from the co-operative union of transplanted Pennsylvania and Virginia stocks, came at the same moment the spirit of governmental control with popular liberty, and the spirit of individual colonization, restive under control. In the initial co-ordination of these two instincts, with the subsequent triumph of the latter over the former, is told the story of the beginning of American expansion.[30]

Soon after his arrival in Rowan, Squire Boone, sr., residing at the Forks of the Yadkin some twelve miles from Salisbury, was chosen as one of the worshipful justices of the county court. From the earliest sessions of the court, three years before the erection of a court-house, he acted in this capacity, deciding the many simple questions arising under frontier conditions: registering the branding marks for cattle; selecting constables and road-overseers, and their routes; determining the scale of prices of foods and liquors for the licensed hostelries; and the like. By the end of 1756 he was presiding in the new court-house—a frame-work structure, thirty feet

[28] *N. C. Col. Rec.*, IX. 349. Martin comments: "These advantages arise I conceive from the vicinity of Virginia, from whence I understand many, invited by the superior excellence of the soil have imigrated to settle in these counties."

[29] Turner, "The Old West", Wis. Hist. Soc. *Proc.*, 1903.

[30] See Henderson, "The Pioneer Contributions of North Carolina to Kentucky", *Charlotte Observer*, November 10, 1913.

long and twenty feet wide, provided with an oval bar and "cases" for the attorneys. One of the attorneys who occupied one of these "cases" and argued suits before Squire Boone was a young man of Granville County, whose geniality had won him many friends and whose ability had won him a large legal practice.[31] "Even in the superior courts where oratory and eloquence are as brilliant and powerful as in Westminster-hall", says an English acquaintance of Henderson's, "he soon became distinguished and eminent, and his superior genius shone forth with great splendour, and universal applause." Wedded to the daughter of an Irish lord,[32] and moving in the refined circle which included a Richard Bennehan, an Alexander Martin, a John Penn, a William Hooper, and their compeers, he was nevertheless conspicuously democratic by conviction and in practice. His law-partner, who married the widow of Lord Keeling, was John Williams—a stout exponent of the principles of democracy. Among his intimate friends was that "aristocrat in temperament, but democrat in politics", Thomas Hart, whom an acquaintance, Dr. J. F. D. Smyth, described as "an accomplished and complete gentleman". Henderson was well acquainted with Squire Boone, frequently appearing on legal business before him; and likewise formed the acquaintance of his son, Daniel, the nomadic spirit, hunter, and trapper, who occasionally told him bizarre and startling tales of his wanderings across the dark green mountains to the fair valleys and boundless hunting grounds beyond. These stories of Western explorations Henderson heard from the lips of Daniel Boone himself, who was eager to remove to the West at the first convenient opportunity.[33]

Daniel Boone was an explorer of remarkable individual initiative. Prior to 1769 he had already travelled as far as Florida on the south and as far as Kentucky on the west. During the period from 1763 to 1769, doubtless through his long extended absences and his enforced neglect of affairs at home, he became deeply involved financially. His nomadic instincts, with the consequent neglect of the work on his farm, seem to have prejudiced even his father against him. The heavy indebtedness which he incurred—indeed the entire career of the simple-hearted pioneer demonstrates his constitutional carelessness in business and financial transactions—involved him in suits instituted against him by some of the most prominent citizens of Salisbury—John Lewis Beard, the philanthro-

[31] The earliest court records of Granville County show that he and his first cousin, John Williams, enjoyed the most extensive practice in the court.

[32] Kingsbury, "Chief Justice Leonard Henderson", *loc. cit.*

[33] Draper's MS. Life of Boone.

pist and devout churchman; Dr. Anthony Newnan, the active Whig; Hugh Montgomery, the wealthy landlord of Wilkes; John Mitchell; and others.[34] In this hour of his poverty and distress, Boone turned to his friends, the law-partners, Henderson and Williams. "A person so just and upright" as Boone could have become involved in such financial difficulties only through a certain naïve indifference to the forms of law and heedless neglect of customary business precaution. In reference to this gloomy period in Boone's career, Thomas Hart wrote his brother Nathaniel in 1780: "I have known Boone in times of old, when poverty and distress had him fast by the hand; and in these wretched circumstances, I have ever found him of a noble and generous soul, despising everything mean."[35]

In the earlier years of Boone's residence in Rowan, at some time prior to 1763, Richard Henderson first formed the acquaintance of Boone. The fact of cardinal importance is that he knew Boone in a two-fold capacity—not only as hunter, trapper, and explorer, but also as surveyor and road-maker. Not without distinct historic significance was it that in the year 1763, and so, at the same time with England's futile proclaimed estoppel of purchase of lands from the Indians by individuals or corporations without crown grants,[36] Richard Henderson one day rose from his "case" in the tiny courthouse of Rowan, and facing the "oval bar" which supported the elevated bench from which Squire Boone, as one of the "worshipful justices", had for a decade dispensed rude justice, moved the following:

> It is ordered that a Waggon Road, the best and nearest, be built from the Shallow Ford upon the Yadkin River to the Town of Salisbury, and the following persons are appointed to lay off and mark the same, to wit, Daniel Boone, Morgan Bryan, Samuel Bryan, and James Bryan . . . and accordingly they appear upon Notice and be qualified before the nearest Magistrate for their Faithful discharge of their office etc.

[34] Court records.

[35] Morehead's *Address*, at Boonesborough (1840), p. 105, note.

[36] The royal proclamation of October 7, 1763, avowed it to be his Majesty's "fixed determination to permit no grants of lands nor any settlements to be made within certain fixed Bounds . . . leaving all that territory within it free for the hunting grounds of those Indian subjects of your majesty". Text in *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, XXXVI. 14–19 (1908). In his elaborate papers on the subject of British Western policy, Professor C. W. Alvord, however, successfully maintains that the royal proclamation of 1763 did not set permanent western limits to the colonies, and that it was the intention of the Board of Trade to promote westward expansion by the peaceful purchase from time to time, under royal authority, of land situated in the Indian reservation. *Cf.* "The Genesis of the Proclamation of 1763", *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, vol. XXXVI.; "The British Ministry and the Treaty of Fort Stanwix", Wisconsin Historical Society *Proceedings*, 1908.

When the time was ripe for the defiance of the edict of crown governors against purchases from the Indians without royal grants, upon the basis of the royal proclamation of 1763, it was but natural that Henderson should engage as the man best fitted to spy out the wilderness of Kentucky and later to cut out a passage thereto through the dense and tangled laurel thickets—a passage far-famed in history as the Wilderness Road—his friend "Dan Boone", as he familiarly called him, whom he had known for many years as a most competent scout and expert road-cutter in the frontier county of Rowan.

V.

The designs which Henderson and his associates cherished for the acquisition of Western lands found early expression in some form of organization. After the proclamation of 1763, which assured the lands at least temporarily to the Indians, these men realized that these lands must eventually be thrown open to colonization.[37] They accordingly organized themselves into some sort of company, for the purpose of engaging an expert scout and surveyor to spy out the Western lands, and later to examine into the feasibility of making a purchase ultimately from the Indians. Their original intention, indubitably, was to colonize the territory thus to be acquired. But when the clouds of war finally gathered and a clash with Great Britain loomed threatening and imminent on the horizon, their original plan of extensive colonization inevitably assumed momentous political consequences; and in the event they endeavored to found a fourteenth American colony in the heart of the Western wilderness.

This company, so far as known, has left no documentary record of its activities in the earlier stages of its existence. All the evidence points to the fact that it consisted of three partners only: Richard Henderson, Thomas Hart, and John Williams. The organization first bore the name of "Richard Henderson and Company". Some years later, after the plans for colonization had passed the stage of preliminary investigation, new partners were successively added. The name of the organization, "Richard Henderson and

[37] The chief object of the proclamation of 1763 was to allay the alarm of the Indians; and in pursuance of this idea the colonists were positively prohibited from making settlements on the Indian lands. Nevertheless the roving bands of determined settlers along the Indian border rendered the situation critical. In the very preamble of the proclamation, the Lords of Trade describe the sovereign as "being desirous that all Our loving subjects, as well of Our Kingdom as of Our Colonies in America, may avail themselves with all convenient Speed, of the great Benefits and Advantages which must accrue therefrom etc." The veiled intent of the Board of Trade, it would appear, was to control, not to prevent, expansion westward.

Company", was altered, first to the "Louisa Company", and then to the "Transylvania Company".[38]

The first exploration which Daniel Boone ever made on behalf of Richard Henderson and Company was in the year following the royal proclamation of 1763. The partners evidently anticipated Washington in the realization that the proclamation was only a temporary expedient to quiet the minds of the Indians. Boone was vastly impressed by the Western territory as a field for settlement; and was eager on his own account to move his family to this new region. It is clear that he anticipated removal to the West with his family, as the immediate result of his first exploration in the interest of Henderson and Company.[39] Boone's enthusiastic descriptions of the Western wilderness retailed to Henderson and his associates, Hart and Williams, doubtless aroused in their minds the first suggestion of the larger opportunities for settlement and investment afforded by the rich but tenantless West. Accordingly they engaged Boone, who upon all his pioneering and hunting expeditions continued to penetrate further and further westward, to do double duty upon his next expedition. Boone was instructed, while hunting and trapping on his own account, to make a wider cast than he had ever made before, to examine the lands with respect to their location and fertility, and to report his findings upon his return.

The expedition must have been transacted with considerable circumspection. In 1767 George Washington, writing to his agent, Crawford, with reference to threatened future competition for the best Western lands, shrewdly counsels: "All this may be avoided by a silent management, and the operation carried on by you under the guize of hunting game."[40] With a business sagacity like that of Washington, who was later to learn of Henderson's desire to found an independent colony in the West, Henderson fully realized that the exploration must be conducted with circumspection, if the lands were to be secured.[41] Boone proved himself a thor-

[38] Kentucky MSS., I.; Draper MSS. *Cf.* Alden, *New Governments west of the Alleghanies before 1780* (Madison, Wis.).

[39] The county records show that in the early part of this same year, *viz.* on February 21, 1764, Daniel Boone and his wife "Rebeckah" sold all their property in North Carolina—consisting of a home and 640 acres of land.

[40] Washington to Crawford, September 21, 1767, Sparks, *Life and Writings of Washington,* II. 346–350. In the same letter, Washington admonishes Crawford to "keep the whole matter a secret, or trust it only to those in whom you may confide, and who can assist you in bringing it to bear by their discoveries of land".

[41] The meagreness of our information on the subject of this initial exploration may thus be naturally explained. An acquaintance of Henderson mentions that the latter preserved the strictest secrecy about his earlier land ventures. Repeatedly taxed afterwards with having acted as the agent of the land company, Boone consistently and most honorably refused to violate Henderson's confidence.

oughly satisfactory agent for the examination of the country, his trustworthiness being in no small measure due to his ingrained taciturnity and his faculty of keeping his own counsel. It is obvious, however, that Henderson gave to Boone, as Washington gave to Crawford, discretion to trust the secret of his errand to those in whom he could confide and who might assist him in making further discoveries of land. In one instance, at least, the circumspect Boone deemed it prudent to communicate the purpose of his mission to some hunters in order to secure the results of their information in regard to the best lands they had encountered in the course of their hunting expedition. In the autumn of 1764, during the journey of the Blevins party of hunters, to their hunting ground on the Rock Castle River, near the Crab Orchard in Kentucky, Daniel Boone came among the hunters, at one of their Tennessee station camps, in order, as expressed in the quaint phraseology of the day, "to be informed of the geography and locography of these woods, saying that he was employed to explore them by Henderson and Company".[42] In this tour of exploration, Boone hunted and scouted through the valleys of the Tennessee and the Holston, but did not penetrate to the fabled region of Kentucky. His companion on this expedition was his relative, Samuel Callaway, and together they accomplished a two-fold object: hunting and trapping on their own account, and secretly prospecting and exploring on behalf of the land company.[43]

VI.

Just why Henderson and his associates did not act immediately upon the report brought back by Boone and Callaway—a report doubtless highly favorable, as was the case with all the "news of a far country" brought home by the pioneers—there is no extant ex-

[42] Haywood, *Tennessee*, p. 35. The accuracy of Haywood's testimony in this instance must be recognized as indisputable. Judge John Haywood was intimately associated, both personally and legally, with Richard Henderson's two sons, Archibald and Leonard; and his successor to the post of reading clerk to the North Carolina House of Commons, in 1789, was his friend, Major Pleasant Henderson, Richard's brother and pioneer with Boone at Boonesborough, and with Robertson at the French Lick. On his removal to Tennessee, Judge Haywood formed the personal acquaintance of many of the pioneers, from whom he received innumerable accounts of their personal experiences. Notable figures among the pioneers in Tennessee, such as James Robertson, John Sevier, and Timothée de Monbrun, were personally known to the Tennessee historians, Haywood and Putnam,

[43] Ramsey (*Annals of Tennessee*) unearthed the fact that Boone, while acting as the secret agent of the land company, was accompanied by Callaway—a fact which Ramsey, with his intimate knowledge of the pioneers and their history, probably derived directly from Callaway or his immediate descendants.

planatory evidence. Henderson and Williams, as law-partners, were engaged in an extensive and lucrative law practice; and in the prosecution of their profession spent a large proportion of their time in travelling from one end of the extensive colony of North Carolina to the other.[44] The heavy obligations of this extensive and rapidly enlarging law business in all probability sufficed to delay the immediate prosecution of the Western enterprise.

It was not, indeed, until several years later that Henderson and Company once more actively interested themselves in the problem of Western investment and colonization. In the *Virginia Gazette* of December 1, 1768, a newspaper in which he advertised, Henderson must have read with astonishment not unmixed with dismay, that "the Six Nations and all their tributaries have granted a vast extent of country to his majesty, and the Proprietaries of Pennsylvania, and settled an advantageous boundary line between their hunting country and this, and the other colonies to the Southward as far as the Cherokee river, for which they received the most valuable present in goods and dollars that was ever given at any conference since the settlement of America." It was now generally bruited about the colony of North Carolina that the Cherokees were deeply resentful because the Northern Indians at the treaty of Fort Stanwix had been handsomely remunerated for territory which they, the Cherokees, claimed from time immemorial.[45] Henderson, who had consulted often with Boone and reflected deeply over the subject, foresaw that the Western lands, though ostensibly thrown open for settlement under the aegis of Virginia, could only be legally obtained by extinguishing the Cherokee title. His prescience was directly confirmed by royal action, when Stuart, superintendent for Indian affairs in the Southern Department, at the treaty of Hard Labor, October 14, 1768, acknowledged the Cherokee title by establishing the western boundary as a line running from the top of Tryon Mountain (now in Polk County, North Carolina, on the South Carolina line) direct to Colonel Chiswell's mine (now Austinville, Virginia), and thence in a straight line to the mouth of the Great Kanawha River.[46]

[44] *Cf.* McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, I. 96–97; Henderson, *Life and Times of Richard Henderson*, ch. II.

[45] *Cf.* Ranck, *Boonesborough* (Filson Club Publications, no. 16); also Henderson, "Forerunners of the Republic: Richard Henderson and American Expansion", *Neale's Monthly*, January, 1913.

[46] *N. C. Col. Rec.*, VII. 851–855. "Should they [the Cherokees] refuse to give it up", writes Johnson to Gage (December 16, 1768), with reference to the action at the treaty of Fort Stanwix, "it is in his majesty's power to prevent the colonies from availing themselves of the late cession in that quarter, till it can be done with safety and the common consent of all who have just pretensions to it". *Cf.* Stone, *Life of Sir William Johnson*, II. 307; *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia*, 1770–1772, preface, p. xix.

It was at this crucial moment that the horse peddler, John Findlay, Boone's old friend of the Braddock campaign, wandered into the valley of the Yadkin. Findlay had actually been successful in reaching Kentucky in 1752; and now delighted Boone with his stories of the desirability of the country and the plentifulness of the game. The conjunction was a fortunate one in many respects. Boone was heavily in debt to his attorneys, the firm of Williams and Henderson, for legal services, and to other prominent citizens of Rowan County. Indeed he had been summoned to appear in Salisbury at the March term of court. John Findlay, John Stuart, and Daniel Boone all came to Salisbury to attend court, Judge Henderson arriving on March 5.[47] The attested presence at Salisbury of Boone, Findlay, and Stuart, three of the six explorers of Kentucky in 1769, simultaneous with Henderson, only a short time before the departure of Boone's party on their tour of exploration, makes it highly probable that the final conference to devise ways and means for the expedition was held at this time and place. Certain it is that on May 1, 1769, Daniel Boone as the confidential agent of Richard Henderson and Company, accompanied by five companions, left his "peaceable habitation" on the Yadkin for a two years' exploration of Kentucky.[48]

Boone and Findlay visited Kentucky in 1769, not only to hunt and trap, but "for the purpose of examining the country".[49] Boone himself relates that he and Stuart, after getting settled in their camp, "proceeded to take a more thorough survey of the country";[50] and the entire course of Boone's actions during this period demonstrates that some powerful influence held him in Kentucky until his work of exploration was completed. Had Boone desired merely to discover a location for his own and neighboring families living at the Forks of the Yadkin, he might easily have discovered such a location in Madison and Garrard counties, which he first visited, or in the

[47] Court records. See also "Diary of Waightstill Avery", *N. C. Univ. Magazine*, 1856. Judge Henderson left Salisbury for Hillsborough on March 16.

[48] Aside from numerous authorities, from Peck, who studied Boone's career during Boone's own lifetime, down to the author of *The Winning of the West*, there is the testimony of those historical students who were fortified by the contemporary documents—Lossing, who examined the Transylvania papers lent him by President D. L. Swain of the University of North Carolina in 1856 (Swain's original letter to Lossing is now in the writer's possession); Hall, who examined the vast mass of evidence in the Hogg Papers, chiefly letters of the partners of the Transylvania Company; and Putnam, authentically informed through his intimate personal acquaintance with the early pioneers as well as through his unrivalled collection of pioneer documents. Thus, independently, from North Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee, the fact is related in identical form, from documentary evidence, as well as from personal record.

[49] Filson.

[50] "Memorial to the Legislature of Kentucky."

neighborhood of Station Camp Creek, in Estill County. Had he desired merely to hunt and fish and trap, he might well have found satiety in the proximity of his first camps. But there was a motive deeper than the desire to discover a location for a few families, or to range far and wide in search of game which was bounteous in plenty in his immediate vicinity. This motive was, assuredly, to employ Boone's own words, "to recruit his shattered circumstances"; and his financial obligations were to Williams and Henderson for legal services, and to other prominent citizens of Rowan County. The prosecution of the task of exhaustively exploring the Kentucky area was indubitably undertaken by Boone in the effort to meet these financial obligations.

Disheartened by his disasters, his two captures by the Indians and the loss of all his peltries, Boone would otherwise have welcomed the opportunity to return to North Carolina with his brother Squire, who came out with supplies.[51] It is extremely likely, in the light of subsequent events, that Squire Boone bore a message from Henderson to Daniel Boone, urging upon him, now that he was in the country, to remain in it long enough to secure a more detailed knowledge of its geographical and topographical features. With Squire Boone, John Stuart, and Alexander Neely as companions, Daniel Boone at once began that elaborate series of explorations ranging from the Kentucky River on the north to the Green and Cumberland rivers on the south. By the first of May, 1770, the exploration of Kentucky had only just begun; so that Boone, fixed in the resolve to accomplish the undertaking upon which he had been despatched, preferred to remain alone in Kentucky while Squire returned home. From this time forward, Daniel Boone ranges far and wide through north-central Kentucky, visiting the Big Lick and the Blue Lick, exploring the valleys of the Kentucky and the Licking, and travelling as far down the Ohio as the Falls, the present Louisville. In July and again in September, following a second return to the settlement for supplies, Squire rejoined Daniel in Kentucky; and from December, 1770, until March, 1771, they scouted through the southern and western portions of Kentucky, exploring the valleys of the Green and Cumberland rivers, and hunting in company with the Long Hunters, among whom were Kasper Mansker, who discovered the lick that bears his name, and Henry Skaggs, who,

[51] *Cf.* Boone's *Autobiography* (Filson). It is problematical but not unlikely that Squire Boone was sent out with these supplies for Daniel Boone and party by the land company. It is noteworthy that Squire Boone was accompanied on his journey by one of the Neely family, Alexander, for whom Henderson had hitherto acted as legal counsel.

because of his knowledge of the Cumberland area, as reported by Boone to Henderson, was subsequently engaged to act as the agent of the land company, fixing his station at Mansker's Lick.[52]

On his return to North Carolina in 1771, Boone's glowing description of Kentucky "soon excited in others the spirit of an enterprise which in point of magnitude and peril, as well as constancy and heroism displayed in its execution, has never been paralleled in the history of America".[53] In 1772, the Watauga settlers secured from the Cherokee Indians, for a valuable consideration, a ten years' lease of the lands upon which they were settled. Boone, who had established friendly relations with James Robertson, communicated to Henderson the details of the leases and purchases which Robertson, Brown, and Sevier had made of the rich valley lands. After consulting with the Indians, Robertson informed Boone, acting as Henderson's confidential agent, that he believed, if the inducement were large enough, the Indians would sell. Following his own disastrous failure to effect individual colonization without attempting to secure by purchase the Indian title, in 1773, Boone in 1774 advised Henderson and his associates that the Cherokees were disposed to sell the Kentucky area.[54] Having previously assured himself of the legal validity of the purchase and after personally visiting the Cherokee chiefs in their principal village to secure their consent to the sale, Henderson proceeded to reorganize the land company, first into the Louisa and then into the Transylvania Company. With the aid of his associates he carried through the treaty of Sycamore Shoals, purchased for £10,000 sterling the Indian title to the greater portion of the Kentucky area, and commissioned Boone to cut out a passage to the heart of Kentucky. Boonesborough became the focus of the great struggles for predominance on the Western frontier.[55] There

[52] An exhaustive study of Boone's itinerary has been made by the present writer, in order to fix the exact route which he followed. In addition to the wealth of local materials, the Draper MSS., including Draper's Life of Boone, are rich in information on the subject. Through the personal investigations of Mr. John P. Arthur, of Asheville, N. C., who went over Boone's route in North Carolina, as well as the researches of the present writer, this portion of the route has recently been marked by the Daughters of the American Revolution under the direction of Mrs. J. Lindsay Patterson, of Winston-Salem, N. C. *Cf. Home and Country,* April, 1914; *Sky-Land,* September, 1914.

[53] Morehead's *Address* at Boonesborough (1840).

[54] In a little newspaper, *The Harbinger,* published at Chapel Hill, N. C., in 1834, the venerable Pleasant Henderson, brother of Richard and fellow-pioneer with Boone at Boonesborough, writing from Tennessee, relates that in 1774 Richard Henderson was "induced to attempt a purchase of that country (the Kentucky area) from the Cherokee Indians through the suggestions and advice of the late Col. Daniel Boone".

[55] *Cf.* the writer's *Life and Times of Richard Henderson*; "The Beginnings of American Expansion"; and "Forerunners of the Republic: Richard Hender-

was the struggle of the white man against the red man, of the colonial against the Briton. There was the struggle of the Transylvania Company, first against royal authority, and then against the authority of Virginia. But deeper than all was the struggle between the spirit of individual colonization as embodied in the pioneers, and the spirit of commercial enterprise as embodied in the Transylvania Company. The conflict between the individualistic democracy of the pioneer and the commercial proprietorship of the Transylvania Company was settled only when George Rogers Clark, with iron hand, forced upon Virginia his own selection as virtual military dictator of the West. The drastic settlement of that conflict also made possible the most spectacular and meteoric campaign in Western history—closing only when Clark and his unterrified frontiersmen grounded their arms in Kaskaskia and Vincennes.[56]

In his appeal to the Kentucky legislature, the octogenarian Boone says that he "may claim, without arrogance, to have been the author of the principal means which contributed to the settlement of a country on the Mississippi and its waters, which now (1812) produces the happiness of a million of his fellow-creatures; and of the exploring and acquisition of a country that will make happy many millions in time to come". The present research compels us to discount the high-flown language of the ancient petitioner for land. Boone was the pathfinder and way-breaker—wonderful independent explorer and equally skilled executant of the designs of others.[57] But to Henderson, Hart, Williams, and their associates, animated by the spirit of constructive civilization, rather than to Boone, with his unsocial and nomadic instincts, belongs the larger measure of credit for the inauguration of the militant expansionist movement of West-

son and American Expansion", *loc. cit.* In a supplementary paper, the present writer purposes to detail, *in extenso,* the history of this expansionist movement from 1772 onward. All the accounts hitherto given of this momentous episode in our national history are singularly fragmentary and inaccurate. The recent discovery by the present writer of many documents not hitherto accessible to historical students clarifies the entire situation. Only now for the first time is it possible to throw into true perspective Boone's abortive effort to invade Kentucky in 1773, his relation to the Transylvania Company in the capacity of confidential agent, Henderson's prudent procedure in securing the highest legal sanction for the purchase, the details of the "Great Treaty" of Sycamore Shoals, the invasion of Kentucky in 1775, and the subsequent history, both governmental and corporate, of the Transylvania Company.

[56] Henderson, "Forerunners of the Republic: George Rogers Clark and the Western Crisis", *Neale's Monthly,* June, 1913; James, *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1771–1781* (Ill. Hist. Soc. Publications, vol. VIII.); Turner, "Western State-Making in the Revolutionary Era", American Historical Review, I. 70–87, 251–269.

[57] *Cf.* Henderson, "Forerunners of the Republic: Daniel Boone", *Neale's Monthly,* February, 1913.

ern colonization. The creative causes of the Westward movement were rooted, not in romance, but in economic enterprise, not in Providence, but in political vision. It was the Transylvania Company which at its own expense successfully colonized the Kentucky area with between two and three hundred men; and with true revolutionary ardor defying the royal authority as expressed through the crown governors of the colonies of North Carolina and Virginia, exhausted all means, through appeals to the Continental Congress, to Patrick Henry, Jefferson, and the Adamses, and finally to the legislature of Virginia, in their ultimately fruitless efforts to create a fourteenth American colony. And yet, despite this failure, Henderson and his associates furnished to the world "one of the most heroic displays of that typical American spirit of comprehensive aggrandizement of which so much is heard to-day".[58] It is a coincidence of historic significance that just one day after the dropping musketry at Lexington and Concord was heard round the world, Henderson and his little band reached the site of the future Boonesborough. Here the colonists reared a bulwark of enduring strength to resist the fierce incursions of bands of hostile savages during the period of the American Revolution. Unquestionably the strenuous borderers, with their roving instincts, would in any event ultimately have established impregnable strongholds in the Kentucky area. But had it not been for the Transylvania Company and Daniel Boone, no secure stronghold, to protect the whites against the savages, might have been established and fortified in 1775. In that event, the American colonies, convulsed in a titanic struggle, might well have seen Kentucky overrun by savage hordes, led by English officers, throughout the Revolution. In consequence, the American colonies at the close of the Revolution would probably have been compelled to leave in British hands the vast and fertile regions beyond the Alleghanies.

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

[58] Hulbert, *Pilots of the Republic.*

DOCUMENTS

Letters relating to the Negotiations at Ghent, 1812–1814

THE history of the negotiations at Ghent is already so fully known that we are not to expect the discovery of new documents which will alter it in its essential features. Certainly it is not imagined that the papers which follow do this; yet it may be thought that, when brought together from a variety of repositories, they cast an interesting light on some aspects of the negotiation, and especially, since nearly all are private letters, upon the state of mind of the commissioners at different periods in their task.

For the first two we are indebted to Professor Frank A. Golder of the State College of Washington, who has been exploring the materials for American history in the archives of St. Petersburg, on behalf of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington. They show the Russian chancellor, Count Romanzoff, sending offers of mediation to Great Britain, through Russia's representative in London, three days before his interview with Adams on September 21 (N. S.), 1812, in which he proposed it to the United States in terms much the same as those of the letter here printed. Romanzoff told Adams that he had already made the offer to Cathcart, British ambassador, who was to transmit it to his government,[1] but the present letter is not mentioned.

Of the other letters, seven are derived from the Crawford Transcripts in the Library of Congress, a small but interesting series of photostat facsimiles of originals in the possession of Miss Fannie Crawford, of Columbus, Mississippi. Crawford, American minister in Paris 1813–1815, was the nearest, of all American public men of the first rank, to the commissioners at Ghent. It was natural that they should write freely to him, and, as Mr. Henry Adams has shown in his *Life of Gallatin*,[2] Crawford was able to perform some substantial services to them. One of his letters is here printed, derived from the papers of Jonathan Russell in the library of Brown University. The letter of Russell to Crawford printed below is of curious interest as anticipating in spirit, and to some extent in sub-

[1] Adams, *Memoirs*, II. 401–404.

[2] Pp. 510–513; see also *Writings of Gallatin*, I. 619, 622. Copies of these same letters of Crawford and Lafayette are among the Jonathan Russell Papers in the library of Brown University.

stance, his virulent attack on Adams, in a letter of the next year to Clay.[3]

Two letters, to which the editor's attention was called by Professor Ulrich B. Phillips of the University of Michigan, are from the Adams manuscripts in the custody of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Two are from the papers of James A. Bayard, possessed by his great-grandson, Richard H. Bayard, Esq., of Baltimore; and one, also of Bayard, is from the cabinet of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. A much fuller exhibit of Bayard's relation to the whole mission will be presented by the ample publication of his papers, as the next volume of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, in the forthcoming *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for 1913.

Cordial thanks are offered to all those possessors or custodians of manuscripts who have contributed to the present collection—Mr. Sergius Goriainov, chief of the archives of the Imperial Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Gaillard Hunt, chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Professor Harry L. Koopman, librarian of Brown University, Mr. Worthington C. Ford of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Mr. Richard H. Bayard, and Dr. John W. Jordan, librarian of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

I. Count Romanzoff to Baron P. de Nicolay.[4]

Monsieur le Baron,

La Paix de la Russie avec l'Angleterre paroissait présenter cet immense benefice au Commerce de presque tous les peuples navigateurs, qu'elle affranchissait leur rélations de cette gêne, de cette tourmente continuelle à la quelle il étoit sans cesse livrée depuis quelques années. L'Empereur consideroit avec plaisir un resultât aussi conforme à toutes Ses pensées et qui se présentoit comme n'étant pas douteux. Il le devient cependant par la guerre qui s'allume entre l'Angleterre et l'Amérique.

Sa Majesté Impériale voit à regret que cette nouvelle episode va placer de si grandes entrâves à la prospérité Commerciale des Nations. L'amour de l'humanité et ce qu'elle doit à Ses peuples, dont le Commerce a déja assés souffert, Lui commande de faire tout ce qui dépendra d'Elle, pour écarter les maux que prépare cette guerre aux Peuples même qui n'y prendront pas de part. Sa Majesté, qui Se plait à rendre justice à la

[3] The letter alluded to, dated Stockholm, October 15, 1815, was printed as a broadside for political use by the Jackson men in 1827, and is reprinted in the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society, XLIV. 308–317.

[4] This document is classified in the Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg as "Londres, 1812, no. 23, Exp." Baron Nicolay was Russian chargé d'affaires at London in the absence of Count Lieven, the ambassador. The language of the letter resembles very closely that which Adams reports Romanzoff as using in an interview with him three days later, September 21. Adams, *Memoirs*, II. 401–403; *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III. 625.

sagesse du Cabinet de St. James, est convaincu qu'il a fait tout ce qu'il pouvait, pour empêcher que cette scission n'éclatât; mais en traitant directement il etoit à cette négociation ce qu'elle pouvoit avoir d'impartial. Dans une discution directe, tout devoit offrir une sorte d'aliment aux préventions et à l'aigreur des partis. Sa Majesté, afin d'obvier à cet inconvenient et charmée de pouvoir donner une preuve de Son amitié à S. M'té le Roy de la Grande Bretagne et également aux Etats Unis d'Amérique, leur offre Sa médiation: Elle vous charge, Monsieur, de la proposer et si elle est acceptée par la Cour de Londres, l'Empereur fera faire la même offre aux Etâts Unis et la négociation, pour un si utile rapprochement, pourroit s'ouvrir à Petersbourg, sous les auspices et la sollicitude directe de Sa Majesté.

L'Empereur le confesse, Il éprouveroit une grande satisfaction, si au gré de Ses voeux, Il parvenoit à éteindre cette guerre nouvelle, dès son Origine.

Je Vous recommande, Monsieur le Baron, de me faire part de la manière dont Mylord Castlereagh aura accueilli la proposition que vous êtes chargé de faire.

Agrées je vous prie l'assurance renouvellée de la Considération très distinguée avec laquelle j'ai l'honneur d'être,

Monsieur le Baron
Votre très humble et très
Obéissant Serviteur
Le Comte de Romanzoff.

St. Petersbourg
ce 6/18 Septembre
1812.

II. Nicolay to Romanzoff.[5]

Monseigneur,

Je n'ai pas négligé de profiter de la prémiére occasion que m'offrait mon entrevûe avec Lord Liverpool pour lui faire part, en attendant l'arrivée de Mylord Castleragh,[6] de la dépèche de Votre Excellence qui contient la proposition de la Médiation de Sa Majesté l'Empereur entre la Grande Bretagne et les Etats Unis. Le Prémier Ministre en me témoignant d'avance la sensibilité avec la quelle une pareille marque d'amitié de la part de Sa Majesté Impériale devait être recüe ici, m'a représenté qu'après toutes les mesures conciliatoires qui avaient été adoptées envers les Etats Américains, Mr. l'amiral Warren, commandant en chef en Amérique, avait en dernier ressort été mûni encore de Pleinpouvoirs de retablir la paix entre les deux Pays;[7] que l'on pouvait en attendre quelque resultat dans un Mois d'ici, et que jusques là il serait peutêtre plus sage de ne rien entreprendre de nouveau. Le début assez désastreux qu'ont éprouvé les opérations militaires des Américains, les nouvelles élections qui commencent le mois prochain, enfin l'esprit public en Amérique qui se prononce asses fortement contre la guerre, toutes ces circonstances paraissent encore entretenir ici de l'espoir pour le retour

[5] This letter bears no date, except the words, in Russian, at the top of the first page, "Received 4 November 1812". It may be referred to as "Londres, 1812, no. 3, Rec."

[6] Liverpool was prime minister at the time, Castlereagh foreign secretary.

[7] See Warren to Monroe, September 30, in *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 595.

prochain des relations amicales avec les Etats Unis. Si Mr. Madison venait a être réélû l'on s'attend à une séparation entre les Provinces du Nord et celles du Sud.

J'ai pensé, Monseigneur, joindre ici pour cette fois le Courier d'Angleterre parcequ'il contient un Article des Etats Unis qui est regardé ici comme très intéressant.

Je suis avec le plus profond respect,
Monseigneur,
de Votre Excellence,
le très-humble et très
obéissant Serviteur
LE B'ON P. DE NICOLAY.

III. CLAY TO W. H. CRAWFORD.[8]

GHENT 2d July 1814

My Dr Sir,

I reached this place on tuesday last after a journey[9] for the most part excessively unpleasant, and found here three of my colleagues, from one of whom I had the pleasure to receive your agreeable favor of the 10th ulto. I also had for the first time an opportunity of reading your interesting communications to the joint mission, and I beg you to accept my individual thanks, as you deserve those of your Country, for the exertions you have made in promoting the [*blot*] of our labours. On the subject of our instructions, in relation to the great question on which the War has turned, my opinion is, that they do not leave us at liberty to conclude a treaty without a relinquishment on the part of the enemy of the pretension complained of. Still I do not believe, in the actual condition of things, that if the continuance of the War depended upon that single point, the American Government would persist in their demand of the abandonment of what is now a mere theoretic pretension, the practical evil having for the present ceased; and if I were persuaded that the interests of our Country demanded of me the personal risk of a violation of instructions I should not hesitate to incur it. But the determination of this question depends on the enquiry whether *now* or a few months hence, when we could certainly hear from home, is the most favorable time for us to negotiate. A more unfavorable moment than the present certainly never could occur, and in this statement you appear to concur, as every [other?] person must. Will the condition be worse a few months hence? On the other side of the Atlantic every thing we hear is cheering—the Creek war terminated[10]—10 millions of the loan filled on terms highly encouraging—rapid progress made on Ontario in the construction of vessels which will give us the ascendancy there; and every reasonable prospect, from these and other circumstances which I will not trouble you with enumerating, of a successful issue to the Campaign. I do not believe, whatever efforts the British Government may make, that they can throw any considerable force into America so as to affect materially the present Campaign. No treaty that we can now conclude can arrest the progress of this campaign.

[8] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress.

[9] From Gothenburg.

[10] By Jackson's victory at the Horseshoe Bend, March 29, 1814.

On this side of the Atlantic is the aspect of affairs likely, by the delay I have supposed, to become worse for us? I think, my dear Sir, affairs here are far from being settled. This Country (I mean the Low Countries) appears to be about to be occupied by the British. For what? It will at least as to us have the effect of giving occupation to a portion of that force which might be sent agt. us. We know that all the great interests of Germany are unsettled. Altho' peace has been made, all the difficult points seem to have been put over to the Congress at Vienna. Is even France, conquered France, satisfied? When she has heaved from her bosom the immense foreign armies that now weigh her down, and her own shall have taken their place, will she not seek to efface the disgrace which her Arms have incurred?

If the negotiation is brought to the single issue, all other questions being disposed of, that we must now, without waiting to hear from America, sign a treaty, waiving the relinquishment of the pretension of impressment, I confess I should pause before I consented to a total rupture of the negotiation. But, my friend, it appears to me, holding the opinion that I do, on the subject of a short delay, that it will be our interest so to manage the negotiation as to take advantage in the turn of events here or at home. I should like to have your views on this matter, which it is not necessary to add, would have great influence with me. I confess I am inclined to think that the British Government will have no difficulty in making a peace leaving Impres't untouched. They will doubtless set up many claims—they will lay their d[emands?], but rely upon it ultimately (and that even without any change here or in America) they will be content to cast us and make us go hence etc. Why shd. they not? Undoubtedly, if we say nothing about impressment, they triumph in the contest.

As to acknowledging their right, our governmt. would neither permit us to sign, nor would I ever sign, a treaty embracing such a stipulation.

Mr. Wilson's project is very much that which Mr. Jeffrey, Editor of the E. Review,[11] when in America, suggested. Altho' it would probably be better for the victims of this tyranny than the existing practice, my opinion is that as it respects the nation, it is not a subject of compromise —there is no midway point on which honor can rest between abandonment of the practice, and total silence in relation to it.

I agree heartily with you that if we can make no peace it is a solemn duty enjoined by our situations so to conduct the negociation as to satisfy the nation that a vigorous and united exertion alone will preserve it.

I thank you for your attention to my request relative to my purposed visit to Paris, and to my friend Mr. Carrol.[12] I long much to see you, but I cannot yet say when I shall have that gratification.

This place is quite comfortable, infinitely more so than Gottenburg. But what think you of our being surrounded by a British garrison?

I confide this letter, which I shd. not trust to the mail, to Mr. Connell, whom I have found a genuinely intelligent and confidential American.

Yr. [*illegible*]
H Clay
1814

[11] *Edinburgh Review*; Francis Jeffrey.
[12] Mr. Carroll was Clay's private secretary.

IV. Bayard to Andrew Bayard.[13]

Ghent 6 August 1814.

My dear Andrew

Since my arrival in this place which was on the 27th of June I have had the pleasure to receive your letter of the 22d of March. You rightly remark that when one is far removed from home, that nothing is more grateful than communications from our friends. During the Six months that I remained at St. Petersberg the only letters I received from the U. States were one from you and one from my son Richard[14] and they were written shortly after I had left the Country. In fact more than a year had elapsed before I received a line from my wife, tho I did not doubt what I have since found to be true that she had written to me frequently. I wrote to you from Amsterdam, since which time I have visited London and Paris.

I arrived in London for an American at a very inauspicious moment.[15] The allies were at Paris and they had just received the news of the abdication of Bonaparte. The whole nation were delirious with joy which was not indulged without bitter invectives against their remaining enemies the Americans. The time of declaring the war had stung them more than the act itself. They considered it as an aid given to their great enemy at a moment when his power was most gigantic and most seriously threatened the subjugation of the continent as well as of themselves. They thirst for a great revenge and the nation will not be satisfied without it. They know little of our Parties. It was America that fell upon them at the crisis of their struggle and it is America now that is to be made to feel the weight of their undivided power. Such is the public voice but what the British Cabinet may think wise or prudent to be done, I can as yet collect only from distant and doubtful inferences.

Nothing favorable can be augured from the delay in sending their Commissioners to the rendezvous agreed to at their instance as the seat of the negociation. Our Commissioners have *all* been here more than a month and we have not yet heard that theirs are even preparing to quit London. We expect them daily, but so we have done for twenty days past, and so we shall do till they arrive, or till we learn that they do not mean to come at all.

I assure you between ourselves, my hopes of peace are very slender. The government of England affect to despise us, but they know that we are a growing and dangerous rival. If they could crush us at the present moment they would not fail to do it. And I am inclined to think that they will not make peace, till they have tried the effect of all their force against us. An united firm and couragious resistance upon our part alone in my opinion can furnish hopes of a safe and honorable peace to the United States.

I wish I could present you with different views but what does it avail to deceive ourselves? By shutting our eyes upon danger we may cease to see it, while in fact we are encreasing it. What I doubt is that if the olive branch be presented to us by one hand, a cup of humiliation and

[13] Bayard Papers. Andrew Bayard (1762–1833), an eminent merchant of Philadelphia, was a first cousin of James A. Bayard, being the son, while James was the nephew and foster-son, of Colonel John Bayard of the Revolutionary army.

[14] The eldest son, Richard Henry Bayard, U. S. senator 1836–1845.

[15] Bayard and Gallatin reached London, from Holland, on April 9.

disgrace will be held out in the other and altho I should rejoice to carry the former to the U. States, yet I shall never consent to be the Bearer of the latter.

Farewell my dear Andrew. I wish you and your family all manner of prosperity and happiness and beg you will all accept the assurance of my best and warmest friendship.

J. A. B.

P. S. *August 20.*[16] The British Commissioners have been here since the 6th. inst. and we have had several conferences. At the last such terms were prescribed as put an end to all hopes of peace. Nothing has been said about Maritime rights nor in fact has any former point of dispute been brought into question. The sovereignty of the lakes and large cessions of territory etc are the price demanded for peace. If the terms proposed are not acceded to, the negociation is to end. The terms will certainly be rejected and the negociation will terminate in a few days.

J. A. B.

V. Clay to Crawford.[17]

Ghent 11th Aug. 1814.

My Dear Crawford,

The deep interest you have taken, and I have no doubt continue to feel, in the result of our negotiation induces me to communicate to you the present state of it, as briefly as possible, reserving for a future occasion more ample details.

The British C[ommissioners] are *instructed* to *insist* upon as a *sine qua non to the conclusion of any treaty of peace that the pacification* shall include the *Indian allies* of *G*[reat] *B*[ritain]; and that an *Indian boundary* shall be *fixed* by the *treaty, setting* apart a *country for them to create a permanent barrier between* the *British provinces* and the *U S with*[in?] *which neither* the *U S nor G. B.* are to be *at liberty* to *purchase* from the *Indians.*

They have further informed us that the *rights* of *fishing* etc. within the *jurisdiction* of *G. B.* which were granted to *America* by the *Treaty* of *peace* will *not* be *continued* without *an equivalent.*

They have asked if we are instructed on those *two* points, to which *we* answered in the negative. Nevertheless *we* expressed a willingness to take up those subjects, with the other matters of negotiation, and receive the *British* views upon them, and to communicate *our own* in *return.* This *they* declined doing, without *we* would give, what *we would not give,* an assurance that a *discussion* might lead to some *provisional article* which we would agree upon *subject* to the *future decision* of *our government.* In this state of things, *they* have *referred* the *subject* to *their government* for its *further orders,* and in the mean time *our conferences* are *suspended.*

From the expressions and manner of the B[ritish] C[ommissioners] I inferred a willingness on their part to *pass over* in *silence* if we were

[16] This postscript is found among the Bayard Papers detached from the letter to which it belongs, but is believed to belong to the letter of August 6 to Andrew Bayard.

[17] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. The words here printed in italics are in cipher in the original.

willing to do so, *the subject of impressment.* This we are *now* authorized *eventually* to do by our late instructions.[18]

I think it probable that the B. C. will be *instructed* to *persist* in their *sine qua non* with the view of getting us to *refer* the subject to *our government.* On such a state of things an important question will arise, upon which I should like to have your opinion, Shall we *break off the negociation?*

I recd. your kind letter by Mr. Myers. I shall never cease to retain the most lively sense of your very friendly offer in relation to myself. Upon that and other subjects I will hereafter communicate with you.

The John Adams will sail in the course of ten or twelve days, if we receive her passport, now daily expected from London. You will do well to prepare the despatches which I presume you intend to expedite by her.

The B. C. have taken a house in town.

Yr friend,
H Clay

P. S. The cypher used is that of which Mr. S. informs me he lately furnished you a Copy.

VI. Bayard to Robert Goodloe Harper.[19]

Ghent 19 August 1814

My dear Harper,

I know you would wish me to answer the question "are you likely to make peace or is the war to continue." Let me tell you, that this question is as doubtful at Ghent at present as it can be at Baltimore. It depended solely upon Us to make the war, but there is another Party to consult in making peace.

In forming your calculations on the subject, you will confine your considerations to the motives solely which Great Britain may be supposed to have to continue the war. Knowing the terms upon which we are authorized to make peace and are disposed to make it, you would say in one moment if these are not acceded to, "let the fate of battles decide the conditions to which we must submit".

If the war continues it is no longer the war of our administration It will be in its character as well as in its operations a defensive war. The views of the British Cabinet are undoubtedly altered by the great changes which have taken place on this Continent. While the power of Bonaparte existed Great Britain had employment for all her resources on this side of the Atlantic.

The war with America was embarrassing and caused a serious diversion of her forces. She then wanted peace and would have made it upon terms not wholly satisfactory to Herself. At present there is no Power in this Hemisphere from which she has anything to dread. She has been vexed for many years by the disputes we have had with Her with

[18] Monroe to the commissioners, June 25, 1814. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.,* III. 703–704.

[19] Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Dreer Collection, American Lawyers, vol. I. Endorsed as received October 12, 1814. Robert Goodloe Harper, Federalist representative from South Carolina 1795–1801, senator from Maryland 1816–1821, had been a colleague and was an intimate friend of Bayard. At this time he was practising law in Baltimore.

respect to her maritime rights. She is jealous of the encreasing resources of our country, of the aptitude of our people for commerce and navigation and their prowess in naval enterprize. She sees at the present moment a state of things which may never occur again, in which she is left without an apprehension of the interference of Any European Power to exert her whole strength against Us. The effort will be made to crush Us altogether and if that be impracticable to inflict such wounds as will put a stop to our growth or at least retard it.

August 20th. While writing to you yesterday I was interrupted by a message from the British Commissioners who desired to have an interview with Us.

Our conferences had been suspended for several days in consequence of their having requested time to send a Courier to London before they proceeded further. The Courier had returned in the morning, and brought the Ultimatum.[20]

At this meeting the veil with which they had attempted before to cover their designs was thrown aside. Their terms were those of a Conqueror to a conquered People. The former points of dispute have not been the Subjects of a moments consideration. Maritime pretensions have been thrown far in the back ground and concessions of the most ruinous and disgraceful description have been required.

I trust in God that when the character of the war is so totally changed and when we are not simply contending for the honor of the nation but driven to fight for its existence, the Federalists will prove themselves, what I have always believed them to be, the true and faithful friends of their Country. As to the origin of the war we are all agreed. But when peace is refused upon just and moderate terms and the most extrava[ga]nt pretensions are advanced, what is left for Us but to fight manfully or submit to disgrace and ruin.

The negociation is not absolutely ended, but little more remains than the form of closing it.

I thought I owed to you this communication from the confidence which has always subsisted between Us on political subjects.

Believe me my dear Harper
with sentiments of great esteem and regard
Your friend and obt. Sert.

J. A. Bayard

Robert G. Harper Esqr.

VII. Adams to Crawford.[21]

W. H. Crawford Esqr.
Minister Plenipotentiary U. S. Paris.

Ghent 29 August, 1814.

Dear Sir,

I scarcely know how to apologize to you, for having yet to reply to your favour of 12 July, which was received by me on the 16th. The

[20] See the note of the British commissioners, August 19. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 710.

[21] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. The letter will also be printed, presumably from Adams's draft, in Mr. Ford's *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, vol. V. The italics of the concluding lines represent words in cipher.

simple fact has been, that being without the assistance of a Secretary, and having to dispatch by the John Adams the return of nearly a year's correspondence from our own Country, I postponed from day to day the reply due to you, merely because it could at any day be transmitted, until several weeks have elapsed, leaving the duty still to be performed.

I have been the less scrupulous in performing it sooner, because I have known that some of our Colleagues were more punctual, and particularly that our excellent friend, Mr Clay, had kept you well informed of the progress of our Negotiation.

The result has been such as was to be expected. It is natural that we should feel, and we do all feel a deep disappointment at the failure of the attempt to restore to our Country the blessings of Peace; especially as by changing the grounds upon which the War is to be continued, Great Britain has opened to us the alternative of a long, expensive and sanguinary War, or of submission to disgraceful conditions, and sacrifices little short of Independence itself. It is the crisis which must try the temper of our Country. If the dangers which now hang over our heads, should intimidate our People into the Spirit of concession, if the temper of compounding for sacrifices should manifest itself in any strength, there will be nothing left us worth defending. But if our Countrymen are not all degenerate, if there is a drop of the blood flowing in their veins that carried their fathers through the Revolutionary War, the prolongation of hostilities will only be to secure to us ultimately a more glorious triumph. I have not so ill an opinion of them as to believe they will sink immediately in the struggle before them; but I wish the real Statesmen among us may form what I fear very few of them have yet formed, a true estimate of our Condition. I wish them to look all our dangers in the face, and to their full extent. The rupture of this Negotiation not only frustrates all hope of Peace for the present year, but at least also for the next. All the present preparations in England are calculated for operation the next Campaign. The forces they have sent out already, and those they are about to dispatch are so large, and composed of such troops that they *must* in the first instance make powerful impressions, and obtain brilliant successes. The actual state of things both in Europe and America, as well as the experience of our former War, proves this to as full demonstration as if the official Accounts were already published in the London Gazette. The Spirit that is prepared for disaster is least likely to be broken down by it when it comes. We must not flatter ourselves with delusive estimates of our dangers, and we must expect to pass through the career of British triumph and exultation at our Calamities, before we can lead them to the result that they bring our enemy no nearer to his object than his defeats.

Mr. Russell and myself have received an instruction of the same tenour from the Secretary of State to make a representation against Cochran's proclamation of blocade of twenty fifth April last.[22] *I suppose you must have received a similar instruction. It would be gratifying and perhaps useful for us to know whether this is the case, and if so, whether you have done anything under the instructions, and generally what are the views of this subject entertained at the present court of France.*

You are instructed that we have rejected the preliminary sine qua

22 Proclamation printed in Niles, VI. 182.

non to which the adverse party has adhered. We are only waiting for their official reply and shall not remain here beyond a week or ten days.

I am with respect etc

J. Qu. Adams

P. S. 31 Augt. The John Adams sailed from the Texel on Sunday. *The B*[ritish] *P*[lenipotentiarie]*s have referred our note to their government.* I entreat a line from you by return of the mail if you duly receive this Letter.

VIII. Crawford to the Commissioners.[23]

Paris 13th Sept. 1814

Their Excellencies
The Envoys of the United States
at Ghent

Gentlemen

The English newspapers continue to speculate on the probable result of the negotiation. They assert that you have submitted a counter-project and have demanded an armistice by sea and land until it shall have been definitively accepted or rejected. I can hardly believe that the negotiation has taken this direction. I cannot conceive how with a sine qua non, which closed the door of discussion at the very threshold of the negotiation, you can have had the address to present to the consideration of the British Envoys, questions which they had determined not to discuss. If this is the case the views of the British ministry must materially have changed since the commencement of the negotiation. Perhaps I can give a clue to the labyrinth in which you may be involved. Erick Bolman is now at Paris.[24] He came direct from England with a letter from Arbuthnot,[25] a subordinate member of the British ministry, to Lord Castlereagh. He follows him to Vienna. This philosophic and science-loving man, it seems, has undertaken a voyage from the United States to impart to the chymists and mecanicians of Europe his discoveries in rendering zinc maleable, and is going to Austria, which he has been forbidden to enter, and where patents have never been granted, to establish steam-boats on the Danube. This man asserts that he had an interview, the first of this month, with A—— at which Vansitart[26] was to have been present, but was prevented by business. He says that he insisted upon the necessity of making peace with the United States, upon liberal terms, and that if the war was continued on account of the extravagant demands of England that all parties will be united, and the expectations of the ministry completely disappointed. That this course will effectually put down the federal party and exalt the present administration. That the latter has always contended that the British nation was jealous of the

[23] Russell Papers, Library of Brown University.

[24] Erick Bollman (1769–1821), the German physician who made himself famous by the rescue of Lafayette from prison at Olmütz, and then, migrating to America, was implicated in Burr's conspiracy in 1806, as Burr's agent in New Orleans. The Bayard Papers contain several letters from him of about this time.

[25] No doubt Charles Arbuthnot (1767–1850), secretary to the Treasury.

[26] Nicholas Vansittart (1766–1851), chancellor of the exchequer, afterward Lord Bexley.

prosperity of the United States, and sought every occasion to destroy it, while the other party had a more favourable opinion of her amity; That the further prosecution of the war will verify all the assertions of the former and disappoint all the expectations of the latter. He represented himself as the enemy of the administration and desirous of removing them from power. Being a Hanoverian by birth, and inimical to the republican party, he conceives gave his representations more weight than those which the ministry are in the habit of receiving. He contrived that this interview should be sought by the ministry. Mr. A—— appeared to be convinced by his statements and reasoning, and expressed a strong desire that he would see lord C—— and make the same communication to him. For this purpose the letter, previously mentioned, was written. This is the history which he has given under circumstances which induce me to believe that he intended it should reach me. In stating to a friend of his in this city that the further prosecution of the war would unite all parties and call into activity all the talents of the country he suggested the probability of Colo. Burr's employment in a military capacity. This suggestion naturally presents to the mind the probability that he may yet be the infatuated tool of that restless and unprincipled man. That he has had an interview with Mr. R. A.[27] I readily believe, that if the nature of the demands which have been made in the negotiation were disclosed to him he remonstrated against them and endeavoured to convince the ministry that they were defeating their own views, may reasonably be admitted; but it is highly improbable that he made any exertions to promote the interests of the United States. This I can hardly believe. He expressed a hope that he had done something for America and says that the Neptune has not been ordered to Brest as was intended. This he attributes to a change of views in the British Cabinet effected by his representations. Haec credeat Judaes appella sed non ego.[28] I cannot give credit to this zinc and steam boat story. I cannot believe that this is the reason that induces him to expose his person to the danger which he would incur by venturing to Vienna unprotected by the British ministry. No—the thing is impossible. He is the minister of mischief to the United States. If my conjectures are correct you will be kept in a state of suspence or will be amused with various projects and devices until the propositions with which he is charged shall have been decided. Believing as I do that your exertions cannot be successful and that the negotiation cannot be broken off upon propositions more favourable to the interest of our country than upon their sine qua non I shall rejoice to hear of your leaving Ghent.

With my best wishes for the success of your efforts accept those for your individual happiness.

Wm. H. Crawford.

IX. Clay to Crawford.[29]

Ghent 17th Oct. 1814

I wish, my dear Crawford, it were possible to pass over in silence, and bury in oblivion, the distressing events which have occurred at home.[30]

27 Probably meaning Mr. *Charles* Arbuthnot, as above.
28 Meaning "Haec credat Judaeus Apella", etc.
29 Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress.
30 The capture of Washington, August 24–25, and ensuing events.

But it would be in vain to attempt to conceal that they have given me the deepest affliction. The enemy it is true has lost much in character, at least in the estimation of the impartial world. And the loss of public property gives me comparatively no pain. What does wound me to the very soul is, that a set of pirates and incendiaries should have been permitted to pollute our soil, conflagrate our Capital, and return unpunished to their ships! No consolation is afforded us by the late intelligence from America. It appears that by the unfortunate failure of Chauncey to co-operate with Brown, the campaign is lost, and we are compelled every where to act upon the defensive.[31] Drummond, who I thought was caught, will escape, if he does not take Gains; and consequently Chauncey's whole flotilla is seriously endangered. I tremble indeed whenever I take up a late newspaper. Hope alone sustains me!

My last letter apprized you that we had rejected the proposition, made a sine qua non, to include the Indians in the peace, as the allies of G. Britain, and expressed the expectation that a rupture of the negotiation, or an abandonment of the principle by the other party must probably ensue. Neither alternative has occurred. Still coming down, they have changed again their ground, and sent in an article of which the enclosed is a Copy, which they declared to be their ultimatum,[32] and that upon our acceptance of it depended their remaining in Ghent. As this article strips their principle of some of its most exceptionable features, and as we did not like a rupture upon such ground, especially as it was highly probable that the article itself would be inoperative by a previous pacification of the Indians, we concluded to accept it, with the full knowledge by the other party that our Government, having given no instructions on the subject, was free to adopt or reject it. We wished at the same time the presentation to us, of a projet of a treaty, offering immediately after to furnish a counter-projet. Our answer to this report was delivered on friday last,[33] and we have since been informally told that it has been sent to London, and that no reply will be given until the return of the messenger, which will be about the first of next week.

There is much reason to believe that the other party has aimed to protract the negotiation here so as to make it subservient to his views at Vienna. Under this persuasion I urged the propriety of placing the true state and prospects of the whole business in possession of the French and Russian Governments; and had actually prepared a letter which was agreed to be sent to you from the mission. But the complexion of the last note seems to render this course somewhat questionable, especially at this late period, and when there is so little reason to hope for co-operation from any part of Europe.

We have however deemed it eligible, in consonance with views entertained by the Govt. when I left America, in relation to a Congress which it was supposed would be held upon the Rhine, to send Mr.

[31] Clay accepts Brown's view of the matter, as expressed in his letter of July 13 to Chauncey; but see Henry Adams, *History*, VIII. 46, 81. The allusions which follow are, of course, to the disappointing termination of the Niagara campaign.

[32] The article enclosed in the note of the British commissioners of October 8. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 723.

[33] *Ibid.* The American note is there dated as of October 13 (Thursday), but was in fact sent the next day. Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 53.

Shaler[34] to Vienna to collect what information he can. He will go in no official character, and will observe all practicable secrecy. If you can furnish him any letters calculated to promote the object of his mission or can facilitate, after arriving at Vienna, his correspondence with us, you will oblige us. Perhaps this latter aid may be obtained through the French couriers.

You have been apprized of the 25th inst being fixed for the sailing of the Chauncey. I think it probable that it may be a day or two later.

I hope my omitting to communicate heretofore to you my decision as to the mission which you fill[35] has subjected you to no inconvenience; indeed I cannot suppose that any such effect could happen. When you first mentioned your kind offer to me I expected very soon to be with you in Paris, and hence delayed making it. I find, by a letter which Mr. Boyd[36] brought me, that the District I formerly represented in Congress has again returned me. I cannot therefore accept of any situation which would disable me from fulfilling the expectations of those who have so honorably noticed me. Had not that event occurred Europe has no attractions for me sufficient to detain me here beyond the termination of my present duties or to bring me back again, when I shall be so happy as once more to see our native land.[37]

P. S. Since writing the preceding,
we have abandoned the intention of
sending Mr. Shaler.[38]

H. C.

By his Excy. Leave I have
the honour to add the assurances
of my most sincere and friendly regard.
I wish to God, I was in Paris with
Yr. Excellency.

C. Hughes Jr.[39]

X. Adams to Crawford.[40]

W. H. Crawford Esqr., Paris.

Ghent 18 October 1814

Dear Sir,

I had the pleasure of writing to you on the 5th inst. since which Mr. Gallatin has received your favour of the 6th, forwarded from Lille by Mr. Baker,[41] who was detained there by illness. Mr. Boyd will be the bearer of this.

Since I wrote you last, the Negotiation here has apparently taken a turn, which induces a postponement of the joint communication which I then gave you reason to expect. I am convinced with you that Great

34 William Shaler, afterward U. S. consul-general at Algiers and at Havana, was an attaché of the mission.

35 Crawford wished to return to the United States, and in fact left his Paris mission at the end of April, 1815.

36 George Boyd, Adams's brother-in-law. The letter was from Mrs. Clay. Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 43.

37 Clay's signature has been cut from the letter.

38 See Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 55.

39 Christopher Hughes of Baltimore was the secretary of the mission.

40 Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress.

41 Presumably Anthony St. John Baker, secretary of the British mission.

Britain keeps this negotiation open, to further views of policy, which she is promoting at Vienna, but I think she has the further object of availing herself of the impression she expects to make in America during the present campaign, and of the terrors she is holding out for the next. As our remaining here must have a tendency to countenance weakness and indecision on the other side of the atlantic, I sincerely regret that the negotiation has not yet been brought to a close. But to close it has not been in our power. That is to say, there has never been a moment, when we should have been justified in breaking it off, or could have shewn to the world the real policy of Great Britain. By referring every communication from us to their government before they replied to it the British Plenipotentiaries have done their part to consume time; and by varying their propositions upon every answer from us, their Government have done the same. We have at length accepted their article, and asked them for their Projet of a Treaty. We expect their reply on Monday or Tuesday next. The present aspect is of a continuance of the Negotiation, and we are not warranted in saying to France or Russia, that we believe nothing will come of it. We are all ready enough to indulge hopes, but I see no reason for changing the belief that we have constantly entertained. My only apprehension from delay is that the firmness of our own Councils at home, may not be kept up to the tone which has characterised them heretofore. If they stand the test, we shall have no Peace now, but a very good one hereafter.

I am, Dear Sir, very respectfully yours[42]

XI. Bayard to Andrew Bayard.[43]

Ghent 26 Octr. 1814.

My dear Andrew

I had the pleasure to receive your letter by Mr. Bollman dated in July. That and one from Caroline are the only letters I have received since Feby from home.

I expected when I wrote to you by the John Adams to have been at this time near the coast of America.

Not one of us then expected that the negotiation would have continued ten days, and at present not one of us can tell at what time or in what way it will end.

It has clearly been the policy of the British Government to avoid a rupture and to protract for that purpose the discussions. With the same views she created the delays which attended the opening the negotiation.

She was influenced by two motives. 1st. To see the effect of the armaments she had sent to the U. States. 2d. To ascertain the probable result of the proceedings at Vienna.

They certainly did expect that the force sent to America would in the course of the campaign strike a blow which would prostrate the nation at her feet. Whether in that event she would have been satisfied with dictating the terms of an ignominious peace I think very doubtful. it is more likely that she would have been encouraged to aim at complete subjugation. The Capture of Washington was a source of great triumph and exultation and inspired a belief that their troops could not be resisted. This error has been sadly corrected by the repulse in the attack

[42] Signature missing.

[43] Bayard Papers.

upon Baltimore, by the destruction of their fleet on lake Champlain and by the retreat of Prevost from Plattsburg.

No people are more easily elated or depressed by events than the English. We have nothing to hope for but from vigorous and successful measures, so far as the war depends upon ourselves alone. The British force in America must be over come and repelled or the war must end in national disgrace.

Something however is to be expected from the proceedings of the Congress at Vienna.

The french Minister Prince Talleyrand (a new title)[44] has delivered in a strong note which contains a protest on the part of France against the aggrandizement of the other Powers of Europe, while France is confined to her limits of 1792.

It is stated also that it requires that all material questions regarding maritime rights, should be settled by the Congress as equally essential to the peace of Europe as the regulation of territorial pretensions. This note is said to have produced a strong sensation at Vienna and will not fail to excite a corresponding one at London.

If Great Britain thinks it likely that she will in any form be involved in a continental war, she will hasten to make peace with us.

Thus in a great measure does our destiny depend upon operations not under our controle, nor within our view.

There is no probability of an immediate rupture of the negotiations. However disposed the British Government may be to prosecute the War, They will not abandon the means of making peace, if the course of European affairs should render it expedient.

Knowing her policy our conduct has been regulated accordingly. But it is quite possible for her, with no intention finally to make peace, to protract the negotiation for months to come.

I have given up all hopes of returning to the United States this winter. Our ship, the Neptune, is ordered to Brest, as it was not safe to allow her to winter at Antwerp which is commanded by a British force.

I paid a visit a few days ago to Bergen op Zoom which is about 55 miles from this place. It is strongly fortified but was weakly garrisoned when assaulted in March last by the British.[45] The garrison consisted of 2300 young troops, and the town was entered by 2800 British soldiers, the greater part of whom were killed or made prisoners. Many marks of the battle remain upon the trees and houses.

It is quite possible that I may spend some weeks in Paris before the season arrives at which we should be willing to undertake our voyage home, Tho I assure you my taste is so bad that I would infinitely rather find myself in Wilmington than Paris.

I beg to be remembered to all my Cousins who compose your family and also to my relatives in Arch Street to whom I wish all manner of prosperity and happiness.

Adieu and believe me sincerely
yours

J. A. B.

P. S. Do not commit me
in any use of this letter.

[44] Talleyrand had been Prince of Benevento since 1806; but Louis XVIII. had lately made him Prince de Talleyrand.

[45] Sir Thomas Graham attempted to capture the place by a *coup de main*, but was disastrously repulsed by the French. Bayard, Gallatin and his son, and Hughes, went on this journey together. Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 56.

XII. Crawford to Adams.[46]

Paris 26th Oct 1814

My dear Sir,

Mr Boyd arrived on Friday evening and delivered me the letters and packages which you and the other members of the Mission confided to him.

I have in some of my letters said, that if any reliance could be placed upon the sincerity of the British ministry, that a peace is not impracticable. The declaration was made before I knew their last ultimatum. That paper strengthens this conjectural opinion, but still I agree with you that peace is an improbable result. I have no confidence in their sincerity. If they make peace upon the basis now proposed it will be because they have been wholly disappointed in the result of the campaign. It has afforded me the most heartfelt satisfaction to find myself mistaken. The campaign has been much more successful than I had anticipated.

The aspect of affairs now is highly consolatory and encouraging. I hope that Drummond has been Burgoyned in the course of the last month. If this has been done, the campaign will have a brilliant conclusion. The superiority which this event will give to our arms will overbalance the temporary loss of the naval superiority during the last month of the campaign. This superiority however may not be lost. I hope it will not be.

The spirit which the destruction of Washington has excited is generally what it ought to be. Boston will defend itself. Massachusetts will assist her sister states, tho with an air somewhat ungracious. The demon of disunion, and of separation, upon which the enemy have constantly calculated, is about to hide its execrable form. The delusive dreams of conquest, and of separating the States, which have had more or less influence upon the councils of the Prince Regent, will now be entirely broken. The war will shortly become a mere question of interest, of cold calculation. This will give form and consistency to the opposition, if not in the approaching, at least in the Spring, session of Parliament. The nation will then discover that the war taxes must be continued, and that loans must be made, or the surplus of the sinking fund must be diverted from its legitimate object, to meet the current expenses of the year. This will be an unpleasant discovery for Johnny Bull, and cannot fail to produce much dissatisfaction. Admitting that the objects for which the war is to be prosecuted may embrace concessions which will be gratifying to the national pride, and beneficial to their naval superiority, yet it cannot fail to occur to the thinking part of the nation, that these concessions, if obtained, must be temporary in their enjoyment. They must be sensible, that the moment is rapidly approaching when the shackles which force may have imposed, will by force be broken. That it is indeed possible that this period may arrive, even before they have derived any benefit from it. For it is only when she is Belligerent, that these concessions will be useful to her. Should she therefore remain twenty years at peace, she will have prosecuted this war for the attainment of objects, which the greatest possible success could alone give her, and eventually derive no benefit from them. In that time we shall be able, in conjunction with her adversary, to shake off the unequal and hard conditions, which she may have imposed upon us. For myself, I

[46] Adams Papers.

agree entirely with you, that we shall have a good peace, if the war is prosecuted a year or two longer.

I have never looked forward to the ultimate issue of the war, with despondency. The spirit which has burst forth in every part of the nation would be sufficient to dispel every doubt if any has heretofore existed upon the subject.

With sentiments of the highest esteem I am dear Sir your most obedient

and very humble servant

Wm. H. Crawford.

His Excellency John Q. Adams.

XIII. Crawford to Adams.[47]

Paris 10th Nov 1814

Dear Sir

Your favor of the 6th inst has been this moment recd. Mr Storer who will deliver you this, will be able to give you the news of this place.

I have uniformly believed that the transactions at Vienna, would ultimately decide the result of your efforts. The B.[48] ministry no doubt expected that the events of the Campaign would come in aid of their demands, but their ultimate decision was intended from the first to be regulated by the transactions at Vienna. Common report says that the Congress is likely to arrange nothing. The fall in the funds during the last days is attributed to this impression. I confess I place no confidence in these rumors. The affairs of the Continent will be arranged, if not satisfactorily, at least in such manner as to avoid hostilities. If so, I think our struggle must be continued for several campaigns to come. We cannot fail to obtain an honorable peace, if we are true to ourselves. I have never looked forward with dismay to the ultimate issue of the contest. It appears to me that the capture of Drummond has been effected, unless there has been misconduct in the field, by want of foresight and decision in the Cabinet. The moment that our superiority was established upon Lake Ontario, the capture of Drummond and his army became practicable. It ought to have been attempted, even at the hazard of loosing Sackett's harbor. If Izzard has been sent against Kingston instead of being sent to the other end of the lake, it is probable that the enterprise will fail, and Drummond will escape. Kingston must be fortified so as to require a regular siege. Prevost can bring a superior force to its relief, before regular approaches can be made, and the enterprise must prove abortive. It is hardly possible that this view of the subject should not have presented itself to the Cabinet.

If your negotiation continues until the government puts an end to it, you will remain at Ghent until next May. The President will be induced to believe, from the complexion of your first dispatches, that the negotiation is long since at an end.

The dispatches which you will receive in reply, if you receive any, will hardly contain instructions to do what the government will suppose to have been long since accomplished.

[47] Adams Papers.

[48] British. The generals mentioned below are, of course, Lieutenant-General Gordon Drummond, Major-General George Izard, and Sir George Prevost, governor-general of Canada.

It is possible that the reply to your dispatches sent by the Chauncey, may produce some such instructions. At present I see no other obstacle to peace, but what arises from a conviction, that what has already been done, has not been done with good faith. The express consent given to wave the question of impressment, and the abandonment of Indian barrier, and the military possession of the lakes, appears to me to remove the principle obstacles to peace. It is not likely that they will break off the negotiation by adhering to the basis of the uti possidetis. If they do, they have less understanding, than I have hitherto supposed they possess.

In my letter to Mr Russell this morning, which I sent by mail, without knowing of the departure of Mr Storer, I have possibly expressed myself too strongly, and unguardedly, upon the equivalent which he appeared to think would be offered for the fisheries. I may not understand the question, or I may have overlooked the reasons which have weighed with you. However this may be, I assure you that my confidence in the intelligence and correctness of the views of every member of the Commission is so great, that I shall distrust the correctness of my own judgement if it happens to be different from theirs.

I am dear Sir with sentiments of respect, your most ob't and very humble

Serv't

Wm. H. Crawford.

His Ex'y John Q. Adams.

XIV. Russell to Crawford.[49]

Ghent 23d December 1814.

My dear Sir,

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter and note of the 12t and the dispatches for the united states which accompanied them and which shall be forwarded in the manner you suggest.

In noticing the diversity of opinion which may occasionally occur, on particular points, between the members of the mission to which I belong, and which undoubtedly arises from the difference of the impression which the same circumstances make on different men however sincerely united in the pursuit of the same ultimate object, I by no means set up for infallibility or am over-confident that the course of which I may be the advocate, is the best. I am still farther from intending to insinuate any reproach against the patriotism, or integrity or intelligence of my colleagues because I happen to be so unfortunate as not to accord with them in my view of all the subjects, which, in the course of this negotiation, are presented for discussion. My only object in communicating to you these things is to make you better acquainted with the character of our proceedings, to show you that both sides of a question have been examined, and to profit of your information and advice, if to be obtained in season to influence the final decision.

There are so many agents in forming the opinions and producing the convictions of a man, besides his reason, that his argument, however sincere and plausible, may hold only a subordinate rank, and be but the instrument of constitutional infirmity, prepossession or prejudice.

The texture of the nerves is a great thing even with great men and

[49] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. See note 3, above.

the fear or the firmness that results from it may have more concern in giving a direction to the policy of an able statesman than his understanding.

Great irritability of fibre is still more dangerous. It sports with the judgment and sometimes with the character of its victim. It betrays him into inconsistency and extravagance and, after raising him into flights of eccentricity and perhaps of eloquence, leaves him a prey to error and absurdity. If this unfortunate man should, at the same time, be tainted with family pride or infected with the conceit of literary acquirement or of local importance, his reasoning faculties and his patriotism are necessarily circumscribed within very narrow limits and he is liable to mistake the tasteless ostentation of pedantry for science, and his little personal pretensions and the notions of his vicinage for the great interests of his country.[50]

The influence of habit and of education is also unsafe and the wisest and best of men may in vain believe themselves free from the prejudices it necessarily engenders. A long cooperation with a party or a sect imbues the very soul with their colour and whatever purity we may affect, or sincerely endeavour to attain, we still give the same tinge to every thing which we touch. A professional education is, likewise, apt to impose fetters on the mind and to give a mechanical and artificial character even to our reasoning. The tanner believed that leather was the best material for fortifications and the common-lawyer will cite, authoritatively, a black-letter maxim as a clincher on a point of public right.

Aware of these and other frailties of human nature, if I am disposed, perhaps, to distrust too much the opinions of others, I am taught a salutary diffidence in my own. When, however, I encounter a man, in whose heart all the nobler passions have found their home, and whose head is unobscured by the fogs [of] a false education, whose great object is the welfare of his country and who pursues this object with an instinctive good sense that never deceives, I listen to him with unsuspecting confidence, and promptly accord to ingenuosness that implicit faith which I am apt to deny to mere ingenuity.

I pray you to excuse this sentimental excursion and I will now endeavour to make you amends by stating the sober details of business, which I am sure will be more interesting to you.

After my last letter to you of the 2nd we heard nothing from the British Plenips. until the 9th when Mr. Baker, their secretary, called on us to ask a conference for the next day. At this conference they informed us that their amendment to the first article could not be entirely withdrawn but they were willing so to modify it that it should apply only to the islands in Passamaquoddy bay. They gave us also to understand that all our propositions, as a substitute for their additional clause to the 8th article, were inadmissable. On their part however, they presented one (marked A) which you will find enclosed. They at the same time submitted to us for consideration two articles, one

[50] The above paragraph, it is hardly necessary to say, refers to Adams. The next refers to Bayard, Federalist and lawyer; the paragraph of compliment then ensuing, to Clay, apparently.

(marked B) relative to courts of law in the two countries, and the other (marked C) concerning the slave trade.[51]

On the 12th we had another conference at which much conversation took place, particularly concerning the amendments and propositions in relation to the first and eighth articles of our projet.

We contended that the principle of status ante bellum required the restitution of the Passamaquoddy islands and that to retain a possession acquired by force of arms was setting up a title from conquest. That to leave them in possession of those islands on their claim of previous right would be to make a special exception in favour of that right that might influence the tribunal to which its final decision was referred.

They asserted that the honour of Great Britain was concerned in this retention but were not very intelligible in the reasons they assigned for this assertion. They also mentioned, in a desultory way, some facts as evidence of their previous right.

With regard to the navigation of the Mississippi, and the liberty of taking and drying fish we were willing to leave them with the treaty of 1783, our construction considering the stipulations of that treaty, with respect to these points, to be unimpaired, and theirs considering them to be abrogated by the war. Both parties appeared willing to consent to a general provision to treat hereafter on these subjects, if conceived in terms that should neither recognize or prejudice their respective pretensions. Several essays at such a provision were made but not being mutually satisfactory in their results the conference ended without the adjustment of a single point.

We found the British Ministers were without authority even to expound the propositions which they made to us much less to modify them. Their office appears to be of a telegraphic character and they are not even allowed to understand the communications which they transmit.

On the 14th we presented a note of which (D) a copy is enclosed. The paper marked E is the clause therein referred to. This note of course was sent to London for an answer. This answer was received last evening. Our clause respecting the Passamaquoddy islands has been substantially agreed to, excepting the *limitation* of the present possession to years in case the right shall not within that time be decided, which has been expunged. The whole of the eighth article is to be omitted; and the free navigation of the Mississippi and the liberty of taking and curing fish, are left without any specific stipulation, depending on the respective declarations of the parties.

We shall receive the British Ministers at a conference, this day, to fill up the blanks, particularly those with respect to the limitation of capture at sea, and to arrange some of the formalities of the treaty. This done and fair copies of the treaty drawn up, it will be signed.

You have now before you the result of our labours. I will make no

[51] A, B, and C will all be found in the protocol of the conference of December 10. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 743. The conference of that date is fully reported by Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 93–99, and that of December 12, *ibid.*, pp. 104–112. The note D and the paper E, mentioned below, and the answer to them, December 22, are in *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 743–745.

other comment that that I believe we have done the best, or nearly the best, which was practicable in existing circumstances.

I think I shall be at Paris in twelve or fifteen days.

very respectfully and faithfully
my dear sir
Your friend and obedient servant
JONA. RUSSELL.

I expect Mr. Todd[52] would have taken this to Paris but his movements are so uncertain that I have decided on sending it by mail under cover to Hottinguer and Co.

XV. WELLINGTON TO CRAWFORD.[53]

The Duke of Wellington presents his Compliments to Mr. Crauford and has the pleasure to inform him that he has just received a Dispatch from His Majesty's Plenipotentiaries at Ghent, in which they have informed the Duke that they had on the 24th Instant signed a Treaty of Peace and Amity with the plenipotentiaries of the United States

The Duke of Wellington congratulates Mr. Crauford upon an Event which restores the relations of Amity between States, which ought always to have been Friends, and the Duke takes this occasion of assuring Mr. Craufurd of his high consideration

PARIS ce Lundi 9 heures du Soir.

[52] Payne Todd, Mrs. Madison's son, was attached to the mission. Hottinguer and Company were Paris bankers.

[53] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. The date must be December 26, 1814.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Philistines: their History and Civilization. The Schweich Lectures for 1911. By R. A. Stewart Macalister, M.A., F.S.A. (London: Oxford University Press. 1913. Pp. iv, 136.)

Until recently the Philistines were known only from mentions in the Old Testament and in classical writers, but in the course of the last twenty years much additional light has been thrown upon their history by archaeology. This new information Mr. Macalister seeks to gather up and to combine with the facts previously known concerning this interesting people in the lectures delivered before the British Academy on the Schweich Foundation in 1911, and now published in expanded form in this handsome volume. For this task Mr. Macalister (now professor of Celtic archaeology in the University of Dublin) is well qualified. He is a distinguished archaeologist and Orientalist, and for seven years was director of the excavation of the mound of Gezer for the Palestine Exploration Fund. Through his discoveries in this place (published in *The Excavation of Gezer,* 2 vols., 1912) he has added more to our knowledge of the Philistines than any other modern investigator. His book is the best work on this subject in any language, and for many years will doubtless be the standard treatise.

Macalister agrees with all modern historians that the Philistines were not Semites; and that Caphtor, the region from which they are said in the Old Testament to have come, is identical with the Egyptian Keftiu, or the Cretan empire. In the Old Testament they are also called *Krēthî,* or "Cretans". In three passages of the Old Testament they are called *Kārî,* or "Carians", which suggests that they came from Asia Minor rather than from the island of Crete proper. They are first mentioned in an inscription of Ramses III. (*c.* 1200 B. C.) as invading Palestine. Their migration is to be regarded as part of the shifting of races that occurred after the sack of Knossos and the downfall of the Minoan empire. With this agrees the archaeological fact that the Cretan art of the period "Late Minoan III." first appears in Palestine after 1200 B. C.

After this investigation of the origin of the Philistines, the author gives in chapter II. a sketch of their history based upon a full and critical study of the Biblical and other sources. In chapter III. he describes their land, with special emphasis upon the archaeological features of their cities as sites for possible excavation.

The fourth chapter is devoted to a discussion of the culture of the Philistines. The few words that are known to us permit no certain conclusions in regard to the affiliations of their language, except that it is not Semitic, and that it has connections with Asia Minor. The various scripts of Crete, when deciphered, may throw light upon this problem. Of peculiar importance is the Phaestos Disk. The most frequent character on this disk is the head with crested helmet. From the position in which this stands at the beginning of groups of signs it seems as if it must be a determinative before proper names. This crested helmet is identical with the helmet with which Philistines are depicted on the Egyptian monuments, and this suggests that the writers of the Phaestos Disk were near kinsmen of the Philistines. Out of some such alphabet as this with a limited number of signs, and not out of Egyptian or Babylonian, the so-called "Phoenician" alphabet must have been developed. This alphabet first appears in Palestine about 1000 B. C., and it is a plausible conjecture that it was introduced by the Philistines as one of the elements of their Aegean culture. Iron also was probably introduced into Palestine by this people (*cf.* I Sam. 13: 19–23). It is not found in any archaeological level below 1200 B. C. They also were responsible for the introduction of the late Minoan art into Palestine. Five shaft-graves found at Gezer show decided kinship with the shaft-graves at Knossos and Mycenae and are probably Philistine. The art remains that they contained were far in advance of the ordinary Canaanite or Hebrew remains. It is noteworthy also that the only temples that we read about in the Old Testament prior to the building of Solomon's temple are Philistine edifices. This seems to indicate that they were the pioneers in architecture as in the other arts in Palestine. These considerations show how unjustified is the modern use of the word "Philistine" to describe one who is destitute of higher culture.

Lewis Bayles Paton.

Roman Imperialism. By Tenney Frank, Professor of Latin, Bryn Mawr College. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xiii, 365.)

Mr. Frank has been favorably known to students of Latin and Roman history for a number of years for his faithful work upon the diplomatic relations of the Roman Republic. A succession of interesting studies have appeared from his pen in *Classical Philology* and *Klio*. To the historian whose interest does not lead him to read the classical journals the author will be best known through his article upon "Mercantilism and Rome's Foreign Policy" which appeared in volume XVIII. of this review. His book upon *Roman Imperialism* will be heartily welcomed as the work of an able student, thoroughly acquainted with the ancient sources and the results of modern investigation upon the subject.

The period covered is that from the beginning of Rome's history to the death of Caesar, with a brief chapter in conclusion upon the imperialistic policy from Augustus to Trajan. In the first seven chapters, which carry us down to the war with Philip V. of Macedon, the new and dominant note of Mr. Frank's interpretation is the insistence upon the practical application in Roman foreign relations of the *jus fetiale*, which "did not recognize the right of aggression or a desire for more territory as just causes of war". At the time of the appearance of Mr. Frank's article upon the import of the fetial institution the reviewer regarded it as an interesting view which was not and could not be effectively supported because of the condition of our sources on the early history of the republic. In the framework of this connected presentation of Rome's expansion, Mr. Frank's theory of the *jus fetiale* as something more than a religious rite, something really vital and determinative, seems even less convincing, though he has tried hard to make it stand (pp. 8–10, 12, 47, 56, 65 *et al.*). His attempt to square the Roman occupation of Messina in 264 B. C. with the theory of the vital significance of the fetial rules (p. 89) cannot be regarded as convincing. The *results* of Rome's diplomacy during the period when it was guided, if we believe Mr. Frank, by this highly ethical principle, are certain. They are the conquest of the entire peninsula of Italy and the addition of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

Chapters VIII.–XIV. cover the period from 200 B. C. to 90 B. C. Throughout the second century Mr. Frank regards the policy of Rome as anti-imperialistic. He thinks it a great mistake to maintain that the older Scipionic policy was imperialistic (p. 186). In a later chapter (p. 250) he characterizes it as "mildly expansionistic". Cato, too, is anti-imperialistic. When the author says that the Gracchi were not aggressively imperialistic we shall all agree with him. It is not so easy to follow him when he rejects the long-accepted belief that Gaius Gracchus was playing for the support of the moneyed classes at Rome, especially the *equites*, when he arranged for the collection of the taxes of Asia through contracts let by the censors at Rome. The author's explanation of this action as due to Gracchus's passion for "efficiency" and a desire to increase the state revenues is poorly supported by the evidence he cites. Again it is to be noted that the actual result of this century of anti-imperialism was the acquisition of the province of Macedon, including Greece, and the provinces of Africa and Asia. The author's judgment must certainly be called into question when the divergence of policy and result is so great. Despite Mr. Frank's learning and cleverness in presentation it is quite inconceivable to the reviewer that the Roman expansion of the second century B. C. was the result of a policy of "meddling", with no definite principle behind it.

It is a distinct relief to read that the author finds real imperialists at last in the first century B. C. The first of these is Pompey. In chapter XIV. Mr. Frank presents the results of his study of Roman commercial-

ism in its relation to the foreign policies of the state. He is radically opposed to the accepted theory that the policy which broke the prosperity of Rhodes and caused the destruction of Corinth and Carthage in 146 B. C. was commercial. In his judgment Roman commerce does not appear as a determining factor in her foreign relations until the first century B. C. Interesting and cleverly organized as this chapter is, the reviewer regrets that he did not find it convincing. Throughout the book the attitude of the author is anti-Mommsen and the Roman senatorial policy receives a good whitewashing. It is unfortunate that Eumenes of Cardia, in Plutarch's *Eumenes,* has been confused with the Attalid king, Eumenes I. of Pergamum (p. 244). The ample notes appended to each chapter give evidence of vast reading. The index of the book is inadequate, as a reference to the subject of the fetial institution will demonstrate.

W. L. Westermann.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Beneventan Script: a History of the South Italian Minuscule. By E. A. Loew, Ph.D., Research Associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1914. Pp. xix, 384.)

Among the so-called national hands into which the Latin handwritings of the early Middle Ages have been habitually divided in the palaeographical manuals, that termed Lombardic possesses the smallest measure of historical justification. Not only is the name misleading, since this form of writing had nothing to do with the Lombards or even with Lombardy, but, what is more important, the concept is erroneous, since it confuses in one family hands of quite different character from places as far apart as Monte Cassino and Corbie. All this and more was demonstrated by the brilliant investigations of Ludwig Traube, who showed that the unit in the literary history of this period was not the Roman province or the German kingdom but the monastic *scriptorium,* affected of course by regional influences but also by migration and by intercommunication of various sorts. As far as Italy is concerned, a well-defined book-hand arose only in the south, with Monte Cassino as the most active centre and the duchy of Benevento as its approximate territory, whence the medieval name *littera beneventana* which it is now recovering in place of the misnomer Lombardic. This script is the subject of the volume just published by Dr. Loew, an American pupil of Traube already known for his special work in this field, who has worthily carried on the master's tradition in the most thorough and comprehensive study that has yet been made of any of the handwritings of the early Middle Ages. As the result of a personal examination of more than six hundred extant manuscripts of Beneventan origin scattered in all parts of Europe, Dr. Loew has determined the extent and duration of

this form of writing, its rules and traditions, the forms of letters and combinations of letters, punctuation, and methods of abbreviation. How such matters may be of assistance in fixing the date and provenance of a manuscript and in the criticism of its text, those acquainted with Traube's studies will readily recognize. Dr. Loew has also an eye for matters of more general interest, for he realizes the importance of southern Italy in the history of medieval culture and is able to point out what we owe to the activity of Beneventan scribes. Thus Monte Cassino alone is responsible for the preservation to the modern world of Varro, Apuleius, the *Histories* of Tacitus, and a large part of the *Annals*; while extant manuscripts prove that the Greek physicians were known in the south before the time of Constantinus Africanus. The discovery of Beneventan *scriptoria* at Zara, Ragusa, and other points on the Dalmatian coast offers interesting proof that these outposts of Latin civilization derived their culture from Apulia and not from northern Italy. Dr. Loew's work is not only a credit to American scholarship but an excellent illustration of the value of endowing research in the humanities, for his years of patient labor were made possible by the assistance of the Carnegie Institution and Mr. James Loeb, and his results have become accessible to scholars through the liberality of the Clarendon Press, which also announces the publication of an accompanying collection of facsimiles under the title *Scriptura Beneventana.*

A defect of plan is the omission of charter hands, for whose exclusion no reason is given. One can well appreciate that any adequate treatment of the subject would have carried the author well beyond the limits of the present volume, but something should have been attempted, if only for purposes of comparison. The amount of dated and placed material in charters is far greater than in codices, and an examination of the originals at Naples, Cava, and Monte Cassino—to go no further afield—would at least have afforded a means of controlling the results gained from other sources. Such explorations might also possibly have made additions to the small number of cartularies mentioned in Dr. Loew's list of Beneventan manuscripts.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A Select Bibliography for the Study, Sources, and Literature of English Mediaeval Economic History. Compiled by a Seminar of the London School of Economics under the Supervision of HUBERT HALL, F.S.A., Reader in Palaeography and Economic History, University of London. (London: P. S. King and Son. 1914. Pp. xiii, 350.)

IT is a source of satisfaction to discover that there are in existence many more bibliographical guides than might be supposed. In the process of compiling the general bibliography of modern British history, the collaborators in that work have been struck with the number of scholarly

and adequate bibliographies of special fields of history that have been disclosed: a list of works concerning John and Sebastian Cabot, a list of works on English military history, a list of printed materials for the study of manorial history, for instance, and scores of similar publications, each giving reasonably full and clear information about sources or books on their respective subjects known or published up to their time. Of this character, though somewhat more general than most other books of its class, is the work recently compiled by Professor Hubert Hall's seminar in the London School of Economics.

An examination of its contents shows that the title of the work is construed broadly. Although it claims to be a bibliography merely of English history, it contains many descriptions of foreign archives and of publications on the history of Continental countries. Again, economic history is so interpreted as to comprise general works including material on economic history, as well as works specifically on economic subjects. Into economic history, moreover, are generously admitted the history of government, Parliament, the law courts, the Church, and military affairs. It is this inclusiveness that accounts for the more than 3000 titles to which the book extends, a much more extended bibliography than economic history, strictly interpreted, requires.

The most original and one of the most valuable characteristics of this work is the large portion of it devoted to that part of the subject described in the title as "the study of economic history". This section includes a very complete list of bibliographies of economic history and allied subjects, descriptions of state and local archives and their contents, both of England and Continental countries, and works on the sciences auxiliary to history. The main body of the work, more than two-thirds of it, is however devoted to lists of materials and works on history proper, divided, according to the usual modern practice, into sources and modern works. Even in the first of these sections information concerning records, surveys, official rolls, and such documents is especially full and valuable. All this evidently reflects and profits by Mr. Hall's special interests and knowledge. Much labor and research have evidently been put upon this work and a vast number of works of value and not familiar to English students are listed in it, while useful bibliographical information concerning more familiar works and collections of sources has in it been made easily accessible. The entries with but few exceptions are only of books published before 1910, an interval having elapsed between the completion of the collections and their publication.

This bibliography is on the whole the most valuable work in its field since the appearance of Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History*, and every student of English history must be grateful for its appearance. Moreover its value like that of Gross is enhanced by an unusually full and excellent index. One would be glad of a few words of criticism, analysis, or description of many works of which we are given only the name with the place and date of publication. There is

also in general a certain lack of discrimination that betokens the work of the collector of titles rather than the scholar. The reasons for this are clearly explained and justified in the preface. The collecting of titles was done by students, the classification and much of the description by Mr. Hall himself. We are far from suggesting that the book is padded, or that titles of works not of serious value are included; and certainly not a word could be spared from the description of the various national archives. At the same time it would certainly have been conducive to clearness and have made this work more valuable to students to have restricted it more rigorously to its announced field and not to have attempted to treat of history so widely.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

English Industries of the Middle Ages: being an Introduction to the Industrial History of Medieval England. By L. F. SALZMANN, B.A., F.S.A. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1913. Pp. xi, 260.)

THE above title will rouse hopes in the reader that at last we have a treatment of an important subject, more detailed than Ashley's, more synthetic than Cunningham's. In this hope he will be somewhat disappointed, for it has not been Mr. Salzmann's ambition to undertake such a task. He has rather availed himself of the opportune moment when the monographs of the *Victoria County History* have revealed new information regarding local industries to combine this with what was already accessible in printed records and in two or three good secondary books (*e. g.*, Lewis's *Stanneries*). But not alone in these fields has he garnered. A diligent worker in the Public Record Office, as his editions of various documents testify, he has been able to add gleanings of his own. They are most considerable in the chapters on metal working and on the mining of lead and silver, but they are easily discernible elsewhere.

To mention the subjects of these two chapters is to indicate Mr. Salzmann's method of treatment. For the most part he has confined himself to discussing the localization of certain industries and the technical processes employed in them. Any account of the marketing and sale of the commodities produced has been intentionally omitted. Such a procedure naturally has shortcomings. It does not result in what may be called a quantitative view of the subject. The relative importance of different manufactured products and the part which they played in domestic and foreign trade escape us. Nor are we told much about the interaction of industrial classes. The author does in a final chapter sketch the characteristics of the craft system. But many questions which are of considerable significance receive scant attention. Such, for instance, are the relation of the mercantile to the industrial crafts, especially in London, the extent to which craft regulations were dictated by

the desire to establish a monopoly, and, not least important, the differentiation of a group of permanent wage earners, the journeymen.

Mr. Salzmann's book is therefore by no means a comprehensive treatise on medieval English *industrial conditions*. It is, on the other hand, a very useful and scholarly discussion of the technique of some ten *industries*. Mining and quarrying, metal-working and pottery-making occupy the author most and constitute more than one-half of his chapters. The items relative to the appearance of cannon in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are new and significant. The description of clothmaking is valuable, serving, as it does, to correct the misapprehension that the importance of the industry in England began only with the coming of Flemish weavers in the time of Edward III. Mr. Salzmann might have strengthened his contention by quoting the ordinance of Edward II. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls,* 1 Edward III., p. 99), a document which shows what the situation was before letters of protection had been issued to Flemings. The author does not explain for us in what relation the mysterious "bureller" stood to the draper; nor has he any doubt that Stamfords derived their name from the Lincolnshire borough rather than from *stamen forte*. One should, however, not be censorious of what Mr. Salzmann has omitted but grateful for a volume that contains much recondite knowledge, to which students of English industrial life will often gladly refer.

HOWARD GRAY.

Der Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters: ein Grundriss der Deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte. Von G. VON BELOW, Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. B. (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer. 1914. Pp. xx, 387.)

THIS work, as the author says in the *Vorwort,* is the fruit of over a quarter of a century of the study and teaching of the constitutional history of medieval Germany.[1] In spite of the expressed purpose to stick strictly to the constitutional side of the subject—"Der Staat des Mittelalters als Staat; die mittelalterliche Verfassung als staatliche Verfassung"—fortunately for the student there is much more latitude of treatment than is implied in the title.

The book is at once a treatise on medieval German institutions and an historiographical survey. The first part, Literaturgeschichte des Problems, will be of keen enjoyment to one interested in historiography. It is divided into three chapters, the first dealing with the great interpreters of medieval German constitutional history from Haller (1768–1834) to Gierke. Between these parentheses, as it were, Eichhorn, Leo, Hegel, Dahlmann, Stahl, Duncker, Mohl, Bluntschli, and Waitz are

1 In 1887–1888 Below published his well-known *Zur Entstehung der Deutschen Städteverfassung,* in which he brilliantly combated the *hofrechtliche* theory of town origins.

passed in review. In these thirty-eight pages the essential contribution of each is set forth with great clearness and conciseness. The inclusion of Haller, to whom eight pages are given, and Leo, who has six, possibly may not be as much a surprise to others as to myself. The waywardness of Haller's scholarship long ago made me indifferent to him. Born in Bern, he lived in Erlangen and in Vienna at the height of Napoleon's power (1801–1806); after the Restoration he went to Paris, where he published, first in French, his work on *La Restauration de la Science Politique* (Below cites the second, German edition of 1820), a work in which Haller pushed to an extreme his legitimist principles. He finally returned to Switzerland, abjured Protestantism, and died in the Catholic canton of Soleure. Leo's career was little less erratic. An enthusiastic member of the *Burschenschaft,* a participant in the Wartburg Festival, under the Holy Alliance Leo became a reactionary; then an ardent Hegelian, then a bitter adversary of it; then a rationalist, under the empire of which thinking he wrote his *Geschichte Italiens*; then a pietist again and reactionary polemist, during which period he wrote the *Skizzen.* Professor Below in spite of this eccentric history nevertheless finds Leo an important connecting link between Haller's theory of a patrimonial state and the Bismarckian policy.

The second chapter in part I. (pp. 38–101) deals with the monographic literature of the chief economic and social historians of Germany in the Middle Ages. Here Wilda, Hegel, Arnold, Nitzsch, Maurer, Sohm, Schmoller, Inama-Sternegg, Heusler, Lamprecht, and Gierke are passed in review. The scholar who wishes in a flash to learn the essential elements in the work of each of these—Wilda's theory of the heathen origin of gilds, Karl Hegel's refutation of the Roman theory of town origins, Nitzsch's *Grossgilde* theory of south German town beginnings, Gierke's compromise theory that the gild was in part a voluntary association, in part an authorized corporation, the variant determinations concerning the *Mark* and the *Hof* as germs of political formation—all these interpretations are succinctly set forth. Naturally Maurer's view that the urban community was a transformation out of the village group, its organization being a larger development of the latter, receives somewhat extended treatment, since Below himself is the leading advocate of this theory to-day. The discussion in this chapter is down to date, for Eberstadt, the newest supporter of the *hofrechtliche* theory, and Müller, the latest exponent of the idea that the gilds had no connection with earlier associations, and Keutgen, who has attempted to show the non-self-sufficiency of the manor and to discover an early germ in the *Aemter* and the law-merchant all receive notice.

In contrast with this long chapter the third is brief. It deals with purely legal historians—Brunner, Schroeder, Schulte, in particular.

Part II., Systematische Darstellung (pp. 112–369), may be described as a kind of manual of German feudal institutions with an historiograph-

ical running commentary. Phrases like "Haben wir es hier nur mit Theorien der Literatur zu tun" frequently recur. After a short prefatory chapter pointing out "Die wirtschaftlichen Voraussetzungen der deutschen Verfassung des Mittelalters" (pp. 112–128), the remainder of the volume is filled by a long, subdivided chapter on particular feudal institutions. Historically the termination point of this survey is about the year 1000, so that the book really requires a sequel which will continue the subject through the Franconian and Hohenstaufen periods.

Professor von Below is distinguished above most modern German writers by an intellectual litheness and a happy style. His *obiter dicta* are often of great suggestiveness and one in search for profitable subjects of investigation in medieval German history will often find the door to such half-opened to him. For example, on page 125, note, Below points out that the activity of free labor in medieval Germany outside of the towns is still a subject demanding examination.

James Westfall Thompson.

Essai sur les Origines de la Chambre des Communes. Par D. Pasquet. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1914. Pp. 271.)

An important service rendered by M. Pasquet's book is to bring together for comment, more completely than has been done before, the various suggestions as to the origin and earliest development of Parliament which have been made in the last fifteen years and the original evidence which bears upon the question. As to the origin of the representative system and the instances which occur before 1265, he does but little more than this. He adds the discussions of another student and these are of value, but the solution of the problem is not materially advanced. The outcome of his investigation is the traditional view, to which he contributes no more than a defense against all suggestions of modification, a defense intelligent and based on a good knowledge of details, but not always convincing. How much still remains to be done by minute investigation of this period may be seen by a comparison of Professor A. B. White's article in volume XIX. of this Review, pages 735–750.

Doubt is raised at the outset as to the keenness of M. Pasquet's institutional insight by the statement on page 1 that the calling to Parliament of the new representatives to join the prelates and barons "is only the extension to new classes of society of the service of court which till then had been demanded by the king of his barons only", an idea wholly impossible to that age. Instead of an extension of the principle of court service, the new practice is evidence of its fatal decline. The great transformation which goes on so rapidly in the reign of Edward I. is no extension of the feudal idea whether in court service, or in military service, or in the aids, but a breaking down of feudal distinctions and properly to be called the end of political feudalism. All these changes

find their beginning in the reign of Henry III., a fact which M. Pasquet seems to have overlooked in the matter of military service.

The fundamental difficulty with M. Pasquet's book is that he does not perceive that for the institutional change which he is studying there are two distinct lines of preparation, the growth of the idea of representation, and the preparation of the institutions by means of which that idea was carried into operation. So long as the messenger who speaks *pro comitatu* carries a predetermined message, he is a deputy merely, and no step has been made towards the representative system, except in the preparation of institutions. When there begins to be evidence that the messenger is supposed to take part with others in the decision of a question not yet settled, without specific instructions and from considerations perhaps not known locally but presented in the assembly, there is evidence that idea and institution are beginning to unite and of the beginning of the representative system. This is what leads M. Pasquet to underrate the importance of the Parliament of 1264, in which he seems to think that I have found the complete representative system instead of the first evidence of its beginning a continuous development. This leads him also to underestimate the value of the suggestion made by Barker in his *Dominican Order and Convocation,* which is a contribution, not to the institutional preparation, but to that of ideas; and to overestimate greatly the importance of the case of 1254, which is on the institutional side solely. On this point see the article of Professor White referred to above.

M. Pasquet evidently supposes himself to disagree with the brief sketch of this evolution which I gave in the *Origin of the English Constitution* more seriously than I think he does. He certainly has made effective and correct use (pp. 28–32) of the suggestion which I there made of the institutional explanation of the action of 1254. His disagreements are in considerable part due to neglecting my qualifying words and, if to more care in this respect he would add a clear distinction between ideas and institutions, I should agree I think with nearly all that he says. Certainly no one could argue that the full representative system is to be found at first, or that the new elements exercised any great influence. It was only a beginning which was then made, but the beginning was made when idea and institution first combined, and not till then.

The best portion of the book is that which treats of the reign of Edward I., because that period has been less minutely examined heretofore. Besides a careful study of the cases, M. Pasquet's suggestions as to the motives of Edward in developing the system are of value. He finds three leading motives: 1. The importance of the knights in the assessment and collecting of the taxes and a wish to secure their co-operation by pledging them to the tax in advance. 2. To obtain the information about conditions throughout the country gained through the petitions presented from the local communities by their representatives. 3. To

bring all his subjects without distinction of feudal relationship under the king's direct authority and so to increase his resources. M. Pasquet tends to attribute a greater political insight to Edward I. than is possible, but these points seem substantially correct. Interesting is the suggestion of the development of early petitions, as seen in 1305, into the first form of legislation in which the House of Commons shares, and of the development of feudal aids into the taxes of the time, which I believe is quite correct, as indicated above (XIX. 344).

G. B. Adams.

The Wars of the Roses, 1377–1471. By R. B. Mowat, M.A. (London: Crosby Lockwood and Son. 1914. Pp. xii, 288.)

This work is a study and narrative of fifteenth-century English politics and their meaning and importance. The period covered is considerably broader than the title of the book would indicate and the delimiting dates 1377–1471, though hardly applicable to the Wars of the Roses, serve at least to indicate the scope of the monograph. The question of origins and background naturally comes first and this is dealt with in three short chapters, one of which describes the family settlement of Edward III., another discusses the constitutional history of the Lancastrian dynasty, and the third gives an account of the politics involved in the French war. Then follow sixteen chapters of purely narrative political character, covering in some detail the politics of the Lancastrian-Yorkist contest to 1471. The work concludes with three chapters of a general nature on the social and governmental conditions under Henry VI. and Edward IV., while a three-page epilogue tells of the accession of Henry VII. An index, a series of eight genealogical tables of royal and baronial houses, and a map to illustrate the Wars of the Roses complete the contents of the volume.

In view of the fact that detailed treatments of all or large part of the period covered by Mr. Mowat are already in print it is too much to expect to find much new material presented. Gairdner's introductions to the *Paston Letters* and Ramsay's two-volume work on *Lancaster and York* both contain more detailed narrative. It would almost seem as if Mr. Mowat could have omitted much of the rather tiresome political details or at least have condensed them considerably and organized his account more effectively. As he presents it here the story is too brief for the seeker after minute details and too full for one who is trying to get a perspective of the period. The value of Mr. Mowat's study, therefore, must depend largely on the interpretations which he gives, as his information is not new. His main thesis seems to be that the famous dictum of Stubbs—"Weak as is the fourteenth century, the fifteenth is weaker still, more futile, more bloody, more immoral", is not justified historically but that out of Lancastrian weakness and inefficiency came Yorkist strength and progressiveness, personified in Edward IV. "The

Wars of the Roses", says Mr. Mowat, "were a rough schooling to England, but they ushered in the glories of the Tudor reigns." The view that the fifteenth century saw the purging of England of many old-time political evils and that Edward IV. finally emerged as a king of the middle classes and so founded the new monarchy is not by any means new. Though still obsessed with ideas of Lancastrian constitutionalism, John Richard Green had the insight to write as follows in his *Short History of the English People*: "The old English Kingship, limited by the forces of feudalism, or by the progress of constitutional freedom, faded suddenly away, and in its place we see, all-absorbing and unrestrained, the despotism of the New Monarchy. . . . The founder of the New Monarchy was Edward IV." That the reign of Edward IV., rather than that of Henry VII., should form the dividing point in English history seems to be a sound contention and Mr. Mowat is to be commended for the general viewpoint expressed in the last and best of his chapters (ch. XXII.), entitled the Work of Edward IV.

In making his arguments and presenting his facts Mr. Mowat is usually clear and direct. There are numerous evidences, however, that in some of the finer and more critical aspects of historical scholarship and composition he is slightly at fault. His book is poorly organized and divided, the chapters being exceedingly varied in length and most of them ridiculously short. The nature of the contents would indicate a three-part organization of the subject-matter as logical and a consolidation into fewer chapters. The foot-notes throughout the work are merely volume and page references to authorities and have no great critical value, while the work as a whole lacks a bibliography or list of works consulted by the author. Even in handling the subject-matter of his special field Mr. Mowat is frequently incorrect or questionable in his viewpoints and statements. He over-emphasizes the Lollard leanings and affiliations of Richard II. and Anne of Bohemia (pp. 9–10); the suddenly gained power and prestige of Henry V. is surely exaggerated (p. 13); too much importance is attached to the failure of the Lancastrian kingship in France (p. 22); in one place (p. 70) Lord Bonvile is classed as a "great Lancastrian lord" while in another (p. 83) he is called "the Yorkist Lord Bonvile"; and there are numerous minor inaccuracies and examples of careless proof-reading throughout the volume. A remarkable example of a conglomeration of errors is seen in the sentence (p. 3), "By the extinction of the first line (1400, death of Richard *III.*), of the fifth line (death of the *young* Duke of Gloucester in *1399*), and by the union of the second and fourth lines in 1410, these royal houses were reduced to two." Other careless mistakes of chronology occur elsewhere and there is throughout a noticeable lack of critical and exact scholarship.

In spite of poor organization of material and errors of various sorts, students of English history will be inclined to welcome Mr. Mowat's study on account of its general correctness of viewpoint, its compara-

tive impartiality, and its convenient size, character, and make-up as a work of reference. The index is fairly adequate and the eight genealogical tables, though inadequately provided with life dates, are useful and interesting.

N. M. Trenholme.

The Reign of Henry the Fifth. By James Hamilton Wylie, M.A., D. Litt. Volume I., 1413–1415. (Cambridge: University Press. 1914. Pp. 589.)

This work is a continuation of the author's *History of England under Henry IV.*, which appeared in four volumes, 1884–1898, and it is similar in scope, idiosyncrasy, and charm, with a real advance in literary quality—and price (25 shillings). The criticism which accompanied the earlier work through its protracted production did not cause the author to curb his antiquarian, word-variant, and genealogical interests, or to reduce the saturation of his text with racy adaptations of contemporary aphorism and epithet. And the new volume is faithful to the tantalizing *genre* established by its predecessors.

To the many familiar with the author's *Henry IV.* it will be superfluous to state that *Henry V.* has little unity in the approved historical sense. The book is in truth a collection of discursive essays, tales, and discrete facts, bearing upon some of the dominant medieval interests, upon many of our modern interests in things medieval, and upon not a few hobbies of the author. The first chapter starts with the coronation of Henry V. and ends with the "epidemic of chin-cough called 'the thumps'", which, *e. g.*, kept the Registrar of the Parliament of Paris awake at night "with racking pains in his head, shoulders, legs, arms, ribs, kidneys, stomach and all over him" (p. 10). The Wylie touch is there! The last chapter (XXVII.) is devoted primarily to the conspiracy which immediately preceded the king's departure for France, and concludes with a five-page analysis of King Henry's will—which was superseded by the will made in 1421. Thus the *termini* of the book are marked off chronologically, but the road between is not fenced, and the author is able to wander into many series of branching by-paths, and to follow them, when he wishes, far behind and beyond the terminal points.

If the new book lacks historical unity, it possesses in a large degree the more primitive unity of life itself. Within the broad confines of his interests the author, attaching himself firmly to the very language of his sources, and with a manifest bias toward virile, racy, odorous, color-full phrases, brings the reader close to some features of Lollardy, superstition, treachery, diplomacy, building, monasteries, hospitals, arms, finance, wages, prices, food, dress, secularization—and hard commonsense of the time. These topics are handled "hither and yon"; one thing leads to another in apparently the most natural and artless fashion;

there is no attempt at systematic *Kulturgeschichte*; there is little generalization; and yet there is order within each chapter, and, best of all, the reader obtains a grasp upon the realities of the life of the times which is rare and precious.

The book, then, is another rich mine of miscellaneous lore upon and around the early fifteenth century, opened by the learned, hearty, and indefatigable author, and judging from the preface to the fourth volume of his *Henry IV.*, he would be well content to have it so regarded. The difference between the title of this work and its predecessor is another indication of his feelings on this point.

The foot-notes, which make up approximately half the book, demonstrate—despite the occasional use of ordinary secondary works for ancillary data—the remarkable breadth and depth of Wylie's scholarship. But the excessive compression of the citations, frequently reduced to the name of the author, or the abbreviated title, and the page, renders the work of identification a task, and the absence of a bibliography makes the defect serious. The numerous appendixes to which the reader is referred are missing. The index is fairly accurate, although it is not equal to that which so nobly completed the *Henry IV.* These blemishes would doubtless have been removed in the course of the publication of the entire work, which was apparently drawn on a much larger scale (one volume to two years) than *Henry IV.* (vol. I., 1399–1404), but the lamented death of the stout-hearted author, February 28, aged seventy, leaves us in doubt as to how much more we are to have. However, considering the interval between the last volume of *Henry IV.* and this volume, broken only by the *Council of Constance* (1900), it seems reasonable to cherish the hope that the author has left matter for at least another volume.

George C. Sellery.

Studies in the History of English Commerce in the Tudor Period: The Organization and Early History of the Muscovy Company. By Armand J. Gerson, Ph.D. *English Trading Expeditions into Asia under the Authority of the Muscovy Company (1557–1581).* By Earnest V. Vaughn, Ph. D. *English Trade in the Baltic during the Reign of Elizabeth.* By Neva Ruth Deardorff, Ph.D. [Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.] (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1912. Pp. xi, 344.)

There is a much greater unity in this work of three graduates of the University of Pennsylvania than the title indicates. The reign of Elizabeth was a time of national quickening in England, and this characteristic is shown nowhere more clearly than in the adventuring of new kinds of foreign commerce in the face of physical and political obstacles. Almost everyone interested in the social life of the sixteenth century has a general acquaintance with the external side of the movement as

recorded in Hakluyt's collection of voyages; but the inner aspect has only recently begun to receive the attention it deserves. These three studies possess a double unity in the latter direction in so far as they describe the stream of commerce from England toward the Baltic and northeastern Europe and also since the chief commodities imported were requisites for the navy and shipping generally. To this the great adventure of the Russia Company in opening an overland route to Persia constitutes a fascinating appendix.

The studies of Dr. Gerson and Dr. Vaughn have been restricted by the want of documents. Both have made a conscientious study of the chief manuscript sources available, and have examined almost all these. That they have not been fortunate in discovering all that might have been found is to a large extent accidental. For instance, certain law papers give much information concerning the results of the Russian and Persian trades as well as the way in which the company managed its affairs. Dr. Gerson blames the great fire of 1666 for the destruction of documents; and, though some papers perished then, the company itself considered another fire in 1838 as having made greater havoc amongst its records. Fortunately the minute-books after 1666 escaped the second catastrophe and a book is at present in preparation which will give extracts from them.

Both the studies relating to the Russia Company are competent and clear. Each is already so concise that I could not do justice to the authors by a brief summary. The narratives can be recommended most cordially to the growing number of students who are anxious to study the elusive springs of the early flow of sea-borne commerce. A few details may be mentioned where various statements require qualification. Though a "dual governorship" was rare it was not peculiar to this company (p. 26). Other instances occur in the Society of Mines Royal, in that of the Mineral and Battery Works, and in the Company of Kathai. The mode of election of members suggested (p. 36) is inconsistent with the joint-stock character of the company. There appear to have been commercial causes (as well as the political ones mentioned on p. 82) for the abrogation of the monopoly in Russia. The alleged poverty of the company (pp. 88, 89) can easily be exaggerated—as a matter of fact it sometimes paid very high dividends. The difficulties of the overland route through Russia to Persia can scarcely be described as "insuperable" (p. 196). If the English had not been able to tap the markets of the Orient *via* the Levant and the Cape of Good Hope, they might, in time, have succeeded by the Caspian.

Dr. Neva R. Deardorff's account of the Eastland Company during the same period is largely new and is of very great interest. Examination of the Polish State Papers at the Public Record Office in London as well as a number of manuscripts at the British Museum has given material for the reconstruction of the life of a typical regulated company. The effects of an intricate political situation on the trade are

explained with clearness. No doubt the central fact is the rise of the Eastland Company on the ruins of the Steelyard—still it is a mistake to date the commencement of the company in the reign of Elizabeth. The charter of 1408 (Rymer, *Foedera,* VIII. 511), in giving the Eastland merchants the privilege of choosing governors and other rights, points to some kind of corporate life. Earlier than that—about the middle of the fourteenth century—there are indications of some kind of organization in the trade. Why this trade declined (as it seems to have done) by the middle of the sixteenth century is a problem: the reason of its advance toward the end of the reign of Elizabeth is to be found in the growing importance of the materials for the building and repair of ships. The dependence of England on imported powder (p. 229) is overstated. The country had a considerable home supply, but it could not be increased rapidly in an emergency. The conversion of Elizabethan currency into modern values (sterling) at a ratio of 1:5 is not very satisfactory. One would wish rather more detailed references than the symbols "A. P. C. X." or "A and O". Those who know the authorities will recognize what is intended, others are more likely to be puzzled than edified.

W. R. Scott.

The Colonising Activities of the English Puritans: the last Phase of the Elizabethan Struggle with Spain. By Arthur Percival Newton, Lecturer in Colonial History, University of London. With an Introduction by Charles M. Andrews. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, I.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1914. Pp. x, 344.)

The records of the Providence Company have hitherto been neglected by American historians, and many students will join Professor Andrews in welcoming this volume as filling in missing parts of our colonial history. Its scope is less broad than its title, since it devotes far more space to the colonies of adventure in the Caribbean Sea than to the contemporary foundation of the commonwealths of New England. Mr. Newton succeeds in linking these enterprises with the exploits of the Elizabethan interlopers and with the invaders of Jamaica—and he might have added, with the later buccaneers. The consolidation of the Puritan party under Pym's leadership during the twelve years of the personal government of Charles I. is also shown to be a result of the association of a score of notables in the Providence Company, of which Pym was the actual manager, though the Earl of Holland was its nominal governor. The Earl of Warwick, Holland's elder brother, may be regarded as the founder of the company, by which he hoped to renew the speculations which had been baffled by the opposing faction in the Virginia and Bermuda companies after 1620. Providence was garrisoned in 1630 in order, as we are told by Sir William Monson, the

last of the Elizabethan admirals, "to nourish and uphold piracies". Though the introduction finds "the unity of Puritan activity in England and New England and the Caribbean" in these pages, the author admits that "the founding of an ideal community and the pursuit of a profitable investment are incompatible aims"; and he cites many pages of Winthrop's journal in which this incompatibility is manifested.

The islands of Old Providence and St. Andrews, which agents of the United States proposed to purchase from Colombia in 1913, were named in the patent to the adventurers in 1630, and the bounds were soon enlarged to include Association, the Tortuga of the buccaneers. These islands remained under the absolute rule of the company in London until they were recaptured by the Spaniard in 1641. The commonwealth of Massachusetts selected magistrates among actual settlers; and the hereditary principle was rejected in vigorous terms when it was proposed in 1636 to introduce an order of "gentlemen of the country", with a reservation of the higher offices for them and their heirs—a proposal which Mr. Newton thinks the colonists should have accepted as a reasonable interpretation of the English constitution. The offer made by two of the "Lords of Providence", Saye and Sele and Brooke, who wished to bring over "other persons of quality", resembles the "new plan to govern Virginia" presented to the king in 1623—perhaps by some ally of Warwick's—as a means to "suppress popular liberty". As an inducement to divert his voyage from New England to Providence in 1638, the company assured a notable minister that men of quality would be preferred in the council and magistracy in the island. To Winthrop, at least, the proposal to found a petty aristocracy under an absolute proprietor was objectionable. By 1640 the governor learned that the "Lords of Providence" were resolved to mobilize the population of New England—Pym counted on drawing men from Virginia also—for the invasion of the Spanish dominions in buccaneering fashion. Winthrop met Saye's plea for this migration, which was coupled with an argument for aristocracy, with due asperity; but Pym's speech in the Short Parliament, with its impatient plea for this transfer and its declaration that the king's reluctance to support privateering in the West Indies was one of the notable grievances of his subjects, had to remain unanswered; and it seems to have converted many divines of the Westminster Assembly into partizans of the enterprise in the Caribbean. Not many colonists were diverted to Providence; but Massachusetts furnished a governor to succeed Nathaniel Butler, one of Warwick's agents in dealing with pirates at Bermuda about 1620. John Humphry, a restless adventurer because of his aristocratic alliances, had long had an eye on Warwick's projects; and in 1630 he had urged the "choice people" of New England to please "our noble friends" by seeking adventures in other regions, leaving the worthless "mixt multitude" behind as tenants of the lands. Absenteeism had not answered in his case, and he was glad to accept a predatory appointment in 1641, though he could not sail in time to reach the island before it was taken by the Spaniards.

In spite of the complaints of the company recited in Pym's speech, Charles I. could hardly have gone further in aiding the West Indian project—unless he had been ready to employ the ship-money fleets in a Spanish war. The courtly Earl of Holland had found it easy to secure royal patents: the original boundaries were enlarged to cover Tortuga—but the Bahamas lay outside the project, as Mr. Newton has to insist in the face of current blunders; a forgotten patent of 1635 for traffic on the Main is here noted for the first time; and it is shown that the king licensed the company to make reprisal for the attack on Providence and the expulsion of the English from Tortuga. Early in 1636 ships were commissioned to take prizes from Spaniards "beyond the Canaries to the southward"—terms which warrant "No peace beyond the Line", and show where the Line was, which Mr. Newton does not explain. He has also missed the most remarkable patent for buccaneering ever issued by an English sovereign. Following the terms of Richelieu's charter for his West India Company in 1634, Charles I. licensed Warwick and his associates in 1638 to seize ships, sack towns, and conquer territory wherever "the free navigation, trade, or commerce of any of our subjects is or shall be denied".

The company had reported that their island could be made profitable only by war or reprisal; and privateering, of which a monopoly was claimed under the patents, was the main feature of the enterprise until Providence was retaken in 1641. Warwick continued to send roving squadrons to the West Indies for several years after that event. As admiral of England and governor-in-chief of the American plantations for the Long Parliament he could disregard the king's revocation of his patent and the remonstrances of the Spanish ambassador. Perhaps he was less of a pirate then than he had been when his ships disturbed traffic in the East and West Indies under a commission from Savoy. Mr. Newton deals gently with the Virginian phase of Warwick's career; he shows that the earl was no mere tool of the court; but he does not like to call him a pirate. The employment of Butler and Elfrith in Providence in spite of their piratical reputation, has to be noted in any discussion of the strife in the Virginia Company.

Access to original papers has given Mr. Newton advantages unattainable in America, and he has cleared up many dark corners. He has missed some printed material however; and he tells less than might be desired about Warwick's colonies at Trinidad and Ruatan, both more interesting than Saybrook, and quite as pertinent to his title. Nor does he allude to the repeated attempts of the Jamaican buccaneers to reclaim Providence under the patent granted to the company. Mr. Newton has few minor errors, and is diligent in economic detail; but some of us would like to be told more about the rovings of Captain William Jackson up to 1645, and where he got the bells which used to hang in the steeples of Boston.

C. G. Calkins.

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second. By Lord Macaulay. Edited by Charles Harding Firth, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. Volume II. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1914. Pp. xx, 517–1039.)

The second volume of the illustrated edition of Lord Macaulay's *History of England* covers the period which began with Monmouth's expedition and ends with the acquittal of the seven bishops, which is to say chapters V. to VIII. inclusive. With this we come full into the stream of the story and can well determine the character and quality of the work the editor and publisher have set themselves to do. As might be expected the illustrations continue to develop largely on the side of portraiture, though the maps and plans, and the facsimiles of contemporary prints, broadsides, and documents are by no means wanting. In effect, however, this is a portrait gallery. It may not be true, as his critics averred, that Macaulay brought into his history every Non-conformist minister who could have any pretension to be remembered and many who had no such claim whatever; it may be true that he described many individuals as well as many circumstances in which no one would or ought to have the slightest interest to-day; yet nothing which has ever been written about Macaulay produces the effect of these illustrations in demonstrating his marvellously intimate acquaintance with the almost innumerable individuals whose actions and characters he chronicles. Here, for the first time, we see the Revolution literally face to face. As to the choice of portraits, when so much is included there is little to be said. The plates in color, Lely's Monmouth, Kneller's James II. and his Shrewsbury, Wissing's Mary of Modena, van Dyck's Children of Charles I., van Ceulen's curious picture of William III. as a child, the extraordinary Harding-Maratti's Sunderland as a Roman, and Maubert's Dryden, with one or two exceptions only make us wish for more. In particular it seems a pity that thus far we have had no color portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough, who, if anyone in the period deserves that honor, certainly seems entitled to a place, as well by her beauty as by her prominence. It is to be hoped that such an opportunity may not be overlooked.

With regard to the plan of the edition it appears that only Macaulay's own words are to be here reproduced. While there are advantages from the standpoint of the scholar, who will probably try—or be able—to purchase only the final volume of notes, and from that of the mere reader who may not care to be bothered with notes at all, there is a certain feeling of disappointment that, in this volume particularly, with its highly controverted points, the Penn case, the Stuart case, and others of less consequence, there is not even a hint that Macaulay's is not the final word. To some, moreover, the device of numbering pages consecutively, so that volume II. begins with page 517 and ends with page

1039, evidently seems to be the only proper device for a definitive edition of a classic whose words are thus forever fixed, embalmed, and sacred to a particular place within the whole. To others it may appear an almost excessive stretch of the definitive spirit, whose advantages are overbalanced by its inconveniences. But, whatever the criticisms, one fact remains, this is an edition not merely worthy of the text but one which is likely to be henceforth regarded as the "standard" Macaulay.

W. C. Abbott.

The Life of Charles Third Earl of Stanhope. Commenced by Ghita Stanhope, revised and completed by G. P. Gooch. (London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. vi, 286.)

Mr. Gooch, at the request of the Hon. and Mrs. Henry Stanhope, presents in this volume the completed biography of the third Earl Stanhope which was begun by their daughter and the earl's great-great-granddaughter, the late Ghita Stanhope, and left unfinished at her death. It is unlikely that this book fairly represents the abilities of either of the collaborating authors, and it is difficult under the circumstances to ascribe praise or blame. The first six chapters, which bring Stanhope to the French Revolution and to his break with his brother-in-law, Pitt, were practically complete at the death of the projector of the work. These chapters are much like the numerous biographies that were published in the mid-Victorian period for the primary purpose of exploiting family papers or paying tribute to the memory of a distinguished relative of the author. In this case the latter purpose predominates, and the family papers have yielded few documents that will be of material use to the students of the history of the time. The tenth chapter, entitled Steamboats and Canals, which is likewise largely the work of Miss Stanhope, "embodies", Mr. Gooch tells us, "the results of prolonged research, and forms a valuable contribution to the history of naval construction and administration". Even this chapter contains no novel points of importance and merely serves to illustrate the exaggerated conservatism which in that period characterized the management of British naval affairs and of the British government in general.

The remaining chapters of the book are from the pen of Mr. Gooch, who is more familiar with the general history of Stanhope's time, and therefore writes with a surer touch than did his collaborator. He traces the career of the eccentric nobleman as a sympathizer with the principles of the French Revolution, an opponent of the war with France, and a consistent supporter of liberal views of religion and politics in England, concluding with a notice of his activities as an inventor and some references to his unfortunate domestic experiences. A majority of the numerous letters which Mr. Gooch quotes at length were already accessible

in print, and few of those he has gleaned from the manuscripts at Chevening and Holland House will be of much service to students of history.

Both of the authors are careless and inconsistent in their citations to authorities. References appear, for example, to "Pitt Papers" (pp. 234, 235), "Chatham Papers" (pp. 21, 38, 232), and "Chatham Correspondence" (p. 23), with no indication of page or bundle. We are referred to "Stanhope Papers", "Chevening Papers", and "Chevening MSS.", with nothing to indicate whether they are one and the same. There is one citation to "Rutland MSS.", with nothing to indicate the volume, page, or manner of publication of that collection of papers (the letter cited is in the printed calendar). There are instances also of carelessness or errors both in the use of language and the statement of fact. For example, Pitt did not "emphatically decline" (p. 53) to be associated with Shelburne in attacking North's party in the early months of 1783, and the use of the single word "Chancellor" to indicate the Chancellor of the Exchequer is questionable to say the least.

William Thomas Laprade.

Le Congrès de Rastatt, 11 Juin 1798–28 Avril 1799. Correspondance et Documents publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par MM. P. Montarlot et L. Pingaud. Tome III. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1913. Pp. 419.)

With thirty-seven Debry and thirty-two Roberjot letters, dating from the outbreak of war with Austria to the assassinations (April 28, 1799), this volume completes a total of three hundred such items, covering the 322 days of residence of Debry and Roberjot at the congress (vols. I. and II., reviewed XVIII. 398, 624). The ninety-eight letters from Roberjot to Talleyrand reveal a faithful, modest diplomat who was the working member of the commission (see III. 150), and are the main contribution of these volumes. The 178 Debry letters constantly disclose the politician in the diplomat's guise, with his wearisome drivel about serving his country; with his know-it-all budgets of gossip diplomatic, punctuated with observations drawn from his crude, sleek self-assurance; and with his growing solicitude for his political future and even his personal safety (III. 147–149). The correspondence in this volume covers a period of waiting that was possibly as malign as watchful, as the letters do not quite conceal; and the commissioners themselves must share with the Directory the responsibility for such unprotected pursuit of dangerous business on the edge of the war zone through more than two months. It is small wonder that, when the Austrians arrived with orders to expel them, the matter came to a bloody issue.

With regard to the crime, this volume contains seventy-seven items, mostly Debry papers, newly published but trivial in value. The really important items are a few translations of documents published in the

well-known German works of Vivenot, Hüffer, Obser, and Criste, due care being taken to select those which shall contribute to "cette longue justification de Jean Debry", as the editors naïvely describe their work (III. 380). These are only a few of the eighty-two similar items calendared in Freiherr von Helfert's *Zur Lösung der Rastatter Gesandtenmord-Frage* (Stuttgart, 1900, pp. 110–116), one of the German works not cited by the editors. Granted the apparent guilt of the Szekler hussars (the Magyar Rough Riders), which was substantially conceded by Thugut and the Archduke Charles (III. 202–212), and the apparent location of responsibility for the military orders in question which is indicated by the archduke, the accusations against the French émigrés, the Directors, and Debry still remain to be disproved, not merely denied. Görger, the brigade commander of the Szeklers, who is in the archduke's list of the culpable, was an émigré, other émigrés were in the fatal neighborhood, and other reasons for suspicion were not lacking. The later despatches between the Directors and their commissioners at Rastatt have a tone that is perhaps peculiar, perhaps unpleasant. This "something queer" is still more noticeable in the treatment of Debry and of the whole affair by the Directors, including Debry's own intimate correspondents, Merlin and Treilhard; and after the *coup d'état* of 30 Prairial, the new Directors, controlled by Sieyès, another intimate correspondent of Debry, treat the affair with cold neglect. Still more pointed was the refusal of Bonaparte to unravel the mystery and his promptitude in closing Debry's mouth, for directly after the treaty of Lunéville, which Debry denounced because it required no reparation for the crime, the troublesome survivor was banished from the tribunate to the harmless silence of the prefecture of the Doubs. The editors have sought by the publication of these papers to do justice to the memory of their hero; it might have been kinder to have burned the papers and allow their hero to be forgotten, than to have revealed him as a hero of melodrama; and, withal, they have not disproved the suspicions which curiously attach to Debry, whose efforts, first to profit politically as the hero of wounds, variously numbered from thirteen to forty, too obviously more damaging to his clothes than to his person, and later to clear himself from suspicion of complicity, border on the ludicrous until they become merely senile.

The net result is three more volumes, with an index, on the Rastatt Congress, and no diminution in the density of the haze about the question. The very suspicions that the volumes seek to allay receive new life, when probable French innocence can array so little proof for its defense. The proof of Austrian guilt still falls just short of being conclusive, because of that possibility of French intrigue.

George Matthew Dutcher.

The Confederation of Europe: a Study of the European Alliance, 1813–1823, as an Experiment in the International Organization of Peace. By Walter Alison Phillips, M.A. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xv, 315.)

In this volume is printed a series of lectures which Mr. Phillips delivered at Oxford University in 1913. The author states in the preface that his purpose was not purely historical; for he wished to illustrate the problems involved in the application of the principles of international law in connection with the movement for the organization of peace.

In Rousseau's critique of Abbé St. Pierre's project for perpetual peace with which Prince Alexander of Russia was made acquainted by his favorite tutor, Frédéric César de La Harpe, Mr. Phillips finds the inspiration of the project for international peace which was proclaimed by Alexander after he became czar. He finds a link in the evolution of Alexander's plan for a universal peace union in the instructions addressed on September 11, 1804, by Prince Czartoryski to Novosiltsov, who was sent by the czar as special envoy to London. The author analyzes the treaty of Chaumont, which he considers the foundation of the confederation of Europe, and the first treaty of Paris, a move in the direction of a wider European concert. He declares that the policy of England at the Congress of Vienna was "to group" Russia with other powers and thus to render the czar harmless—an object which was accomplished in the second treaty of Paris. Mr. Phillips attaches less importance than some other students of this period to the influence which the religious fanatic, Baroness von Krüdener, exerted upon Alexander just before he proclaimed the Holy Alliance. He considers the treaty of alliance of November 10, 1815, between Russia, Prussia, Austria, and England as furnishing a new basis for the confederation of Europe. The persistence with which Czar Alexander clung to his plan for an international peace union, the schemes of Metternich to use the quadruple alliance for his own purposes, and the widening of the rift within the alliance at Troppau and at Laibach are successively discussed.

Mr. Phillips emphasizes the opposition of Castlereagh to the policies of Alexander and of Metternich, while he presents in detail the view that Canning "merely took up and developed the policy of Castlereagh". Perhaps the most enlightening parts of the book are the chapters which describe the interesting debates of the Allies at Aix-la-Chapelle and Verona in regard to Spain and the Indies. The sentences which describe the revolt in the Spanish Indies are inaccurate. In discussing the genesis of the Monroe Doctrine Mr. Phillips suggests that Nesselrode's letters to Tuyll in 1823 really expressed the desire of the czar to include the United States in the Holy Alliance. In conclusion the author declares that the problems involved in the recent peace movement are fundamentally the same as the problems which arose in the history of

the confederation of Europe: namely, those arising from an attempt to protect artificial boundaries. In regard to the bibliography of his subject, Mr. Phillips does not use many authorities that are not mentioned in the bibliographical list in the *Cambridge Modern History* to which the reader is referred.

Singular though it may seem, Mr. Phillips has at times failed to distinguish between the quadruple alliance and the Holy Alliance. As the author indicates in the preface, his views in regard to several important topics had already been suggested in an article on "The Peace Movement and the Holy Alliance" in the *Edinburgh Review* (CCXV. 405–433) and in his chapter on "The Congresses, 1815–1822", in the *Cambridge Modern History* (X. 1–39). But these topics are now discussed in considerable detail; while the text is supported by many references to manuscript material in the Public Record Office. In presenting a detailed and documented study of England's attitude towards the so-called confederation of Europe, Mr. Phillips has performed a real service for students of diplomatic history. But as the diplomatic material dealing with the Allies, which reposes in several archives of the Continent, has not been exploited, the views of Mr. Phillips in regard to the policy of the Continental powers towards the so-called confederation of Europe are not definitive. This volume would have been more useful to students of history if the author had described more fully and clearly the rôle of the Holy Alliance.

W. S. Robertson.

Camillo di Cavour e Mélanie Waldor, secondo Lettere e Documenti inediti. Per Francesco Ruffini. (Turin: Bocca. 1914. Pp. iii, 178.)

The love affairs of Italy's greatest statesmen and patriots cannot be said to have exercised a determining influence upon any of the notable events of the Risorgimento, but they well repay historical investigation for the light which they throw upon the character of the Italian leaders, and because in their love correspondence these men made political declarations and revelations of peculiar frankness, which add materially to our knowledge of public events. The craving for liberty was an absorbing passion but it was easily fused with the passion of love in the glowing days of Risorgimento struggle when women of all classes vied with the men in sacrifices which they were ready to make in the cause of national independence. If the love affairs of Victor Emmanuel, Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi were excluded from the history of modern Italy, evidence of primary importance upon political events would be irreparably lost.

Michelangelo Castelli in his *Il Conte di Cavour* declared that "no woman exercised upon Cavour the least political influence". The latter did, however, himself frequently seek to influence other statesmen *through* women. And *to* the women whom he himself trusted he con-

fided many of his own political aims and secrets. Among these latter Mélanie Villenave Waldor, the French novelist, thanks to Francesco Ruffini's minute researches, now takes a prominent and curious historical place in the period of Cavour's earlier life. For his biographers perhaps the most important of all his letters was that addressed to her in May, 1838, when she sought to persuade him to abandon Piedmont and seek a career in Paris; it contains the patriotic passage: "No, no, it is not by fleeing from one's country because it is unfortunate that one may attain glory. . . . Fortunate or unfortunate my country shall have all my life; I shall never be unfaithful to it, even if I were sure to find elsewhere a brilliant destiny" (pp. 65–66). This letter was already known, but Ruffini has fixed its correct date, placing it three years later in Cavour's life than Chiala had done. Through a second letter, left unpublished by Chiala, Ruffini has been able to discover the fact that Cavour was the protagonist of the Waldor's novel published in 1839, *Alphonse et Juliette*, and has traced several biographical details in the romance. In this letter, dated September 10, 1839, Cavour forecasts the war of 1859: "I conceive the delights of war, when a noble motive inspires one and a glorious purpose is revealed" (p. 146). Again Ruffini finds that a later letter, of April 26, 1849, which has previously been falsely described as addressed to Countess de Circourt, was in reality addressed to the Waldor; it is a letter in which he forecasts the Franco-Italian alliance: "The fate of Italy depends upon that of France" (p. 159). Ruffini suggests that when Italian archives have been unreservedly opened to the historian, it may be discovered that later Cavour, when prime-minister, utilized the influence of the Waldor with the Napoleonic government to further the interests of Italy.

Until now the relations between Cavour and the Waldor have remained completely unknown, save for the letter of 1838. On Cavour's side they were quasi-Platonic. Ruffini's ingenuity in tracing them on the barest evidence would do honor to a Sherlock Holmes, while the care with which he accumulates evidence in support of his statements bespeaks historical method of the highest order. Ruffini's publications place him among the first historians of the Risorgimento.

Cavour's archives at Santena have been freely worked in the preparation of the present volume, and Ruffini has brought out fresh evidence upon another love affair of Cavour. The reason for his having remained a bachelor at this period comes out in another Waldor letter unknown to Chiala: "There is still at the bottom of my heart an image which is an unsurmountable obstacle to marriage" (p. 131). This obstacle was love for a married woman, not the famed "Incognita" but a newly discovered blonde "Innominata".

While the primary interest of the volume for the historian is psychological, the letters throw not a little light upon contemporary customs and conditions in Piedmont. It has been published as volume VIII. in Bocca's *Biblioteca di Storia Contemporanea*.

H. Nelson Gay.

Epistolario di Luigi Carlo Farini. Per cura di Luigi Rava. Con Lettere inedite di Uomini illustri al Farini e Documenti. (Bologna: Nicolà Zanichelli. 1911–1914. Pp. lxii, 837; xlviii, 799; cxv, 621.)

La Giovinezza di un Dittatore, Luigi Carlo Farini, Medico. Per Luigi Messedaglia. Con Introduzione di Luigi Rava. [Biblioteca Storica del Risorgimento Italiano, Serie VII., N. 12.] (Milan, Rome, Naples: Albrigi, Segati, e Compagnia. 1914. Pp. lxii, 553.)

After Chiala's well-known publication of Cavour's *Lettere edite ed inedite,* and Menghini's scholarly and exhaustive national edition of Mazzini's *Scritti editi ed inediti,* this *Epistolario* of Luigi Carlo Farini must be ranked as the most important publication that has been undertaken upon the history of Italy's Risorgimento from 1815 to 1870. The eleven volumes of Baron Ricasoli's *Lettere e Documenti* also constitute a source of first-rate importance, but Ricasoli's work was primarily of local Tuscan interest down to 1859, while his achievements of that year and of his later public life were, generally speaking, already largely understood from public documents outside his own archives. Farini's virile activity and devoted personal sacrifice for the national weal cover a wider field and were of no less vital import. After the "Big Four" who made modern Italy (Cavour, Victor Emmanuel II., Mazzini, and Garibaldi), Farini may well take his place in the national biography as Italy's first public citizen in point of ability, while his actual services as a statesman, in the accomplishment of national independence and unity, rank with those of Massimo d'Azeglio and Ricasoli. A national edition of d'Azeglio's correspondence and works should follow as the next important addition to the *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* of the Risorgimento.

It is fortunate that Farini's important private archives have fallen into the hands of such a competent scholar as Luigi Rava, himself a statesman of distinction. It was the testamentary wish of Farini's son, Domenico Farini, president of the Italian Senate, that Farini's papers should be published, out of justice to his memory, and after the death of Domenico Farini in 1900, the family entrusted them to Rava. But as politics had robbed Italy of a great physician in Luigi Carlo Farini, so to-day politics have done their best to rob Farini of his editor and biographer. Since he undertook the publication of the *Epistolario* Rava has twice been called to hold portfolios in Italian ministries, those of Commerce and Public Instruction successively, and to-day he has entered the recently formed Salandra ministry with the portfolio of Finance.

This extenuating circumstance of the preoccupations of high public office disarms the critic of the *Epistolario* who would complain to the editor of the almost total absence of explanatory notes that characterizes the three volumes thus far published; complete notes would have

added immeasurably to the value of the work. It must have been no small sacrifice for a student such as Rava, possessed of sound historical method, to publish the correspondence in this nude fashion; many of the letters are of absolutely no interest without a detailed knowledge of the circumstances and conditions under which they were written. But it certainly has been much better to give the correspondence to the light as it is, than it would have been to delay publication further. The volumes contain a mass of new material that is indispensable to the just appreciation of many events of the Risorgimento period; the competent student can supply his own commentary, and furthermore Rava has solemnly promised to publish eventually a volume of biography and notes. As Italian ministries are not eternal, the historian has reason to expect that Rava will in good time be able to fulfill his pledge. The important introductions which he has prefixed to the first and third volumes, and which, with some alterations, had been previously published in the *Nuova Antologia* of April 1, 1911, and November 16, 1913, exhibit keen critical ability and a wide historical knowledge. Together they give an excellent biographical sketch of Farini down to 1851. No good life of Farini has been heretofore published, and such as there were, have been proved to be rich in misstatements, by the present *Epistolario*.

Rava has happily printed Farini's letters without omissions, and has supplemented them by a great number of letters of correspondents addressed to him, and also by a few letters, not by Farini, addressed to others; in the third volume the letters of Farini's correspondents considerably surpass in number those written by him. This suggests that many other of his letters may yet come to light. Three letters of Cesare Balbo to Farini are given, but none from Farini to Balbo excepting the published dedication of his *Lo Stato Romano*. But Balbo's archives are known to have been preserved and at least a few good Farini letters addressed to Balbo exist. Farini's letters to Marco Minghetti as given in the *Epistolario* had all been previously published in the latter's *Ricordi*, excepting two relatively unimportant letters regarding a certain Maggi. But Minghetti's papers, which have been deposited by his widow in the Archiginnasio of Bologna, will be unsealed in about ten years, and important unpublished letters of Farini may then be expected, particularly of the period subsequent to 1859, the year with which Minghetti's *Ricordi* end.

The arrangement of the letters is chronological, and the volumes are furnished with excellent indexes of the persons to whom and by whom they are addressed. Several of the letters, particularly in the second volume, are without date, but when Rava prepares his notes he will certainly be able to supply dates to some of these from internal evidence. The letter without date numbered 47 (f) was written on April 11, 1848, as is shown by mention of the "Demonstration against the Treasurer", which took place on that morning. Letter numbered 204 is of September 13, 1848.

Of the letters addressed to Farini a number are from d'Azeglio, unpublished and of particular importance; there are also many notes from Minghetti written when he was Minister of the Interior of Pius IX. in 1848, and when Farini was under-secretary. These and the unpublished letters of many other correspondents and of Farini himself in the period, reveal the state of mind from day to day of the government of Pius IX. during the revolution, and also of the high functionaries in different parts of the Pontifical States; as an historical source this collection of documents is much more important than Farini's four volumes, *Lo Stato Romano,* published 1850–1853, with a political purpose.

The evolution of Farini's own political creed is one of the most interesting revelations of the new documents. On March 28, 1848, Farini wrote (II. 147–148): "I do not understand how brains can conceive the dream of concentrating the government of Italy in the hands of one single prince! I do not know, I do not understand it, even if one looks to a distant future. Now, it is more than a dream, it is delirium, it is madness, it is more than madness, it is moral and political infamy. . . . The unity of Italy . . . consists and must consist in unity of laws, in the federation of national princes under the presidency of the Papacy." Yet fifteen years later Farini was prime-minister of Victor Emmanuel II., king of Italy, in the unification of which Farini had himself figured as one of the most enthusiastic leaders. Farini's political evolution is typical of that of many of Italy's ablest statesmen.

The principal collection of Farini's letters heretofore published consisted of less than one hundred of his letters; the present three volumes contain over 850, besides those of his correspondents; and they come down only to 1851. In the many volumes that must follow we shall have still more important new documents, covering the period of Farini's advocacy of the Crimean expedition, his great achievements as dictator of Emilia in 1859, his work as Piedmontese Minister of the Interior at the time of the expedition of the Thousand in 1860, his royal lieutenancy at Naples in 1861, and his brief term as prime-minister, 1862–1863, which terminated with his death.

The first two volumes of the *Epistolario* have already served for the preparation of a new biography of Farini's "youth" down to 1849, by Luigi Messedaglia, published in the important collection, *Biblioteca Storica del Risorgimento Italiano.* It is a serious historical study, devoted primarily to Farini's labors as a physician, and based in considerable part upon unpublished medical papers of Farini furnished to the writer by Rava. The most valuable part of the volume is the preface by Rava, which contains, among other unpublished documents, seven letters addressed by Farini to Sansone d'Ancona in 1845, which came to light too late to be included in the *Epistolario.*

H. Nelson Gay.

Histoire de la Russie depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos Jours. Par Alfred Rambaud. Sixième édition revue et complétée jusqu'en 1913 par Émile Haumant, Professeur-adjoint à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1914. Pp. 963.)

Rambaud's *Histoire de la Russie* has for a long time been the only general history of Russia available to western readers; it has been translated into German and English. The recent English edition of Klyuchevsky's *History of Russia* has given to the English reader a fuller treatment of the early periods; and Klyuchevsky's work is the best general history produced by Russian scholarship. But these volumes only bring us to Catherine the Great. The new edition of Rambaud, which we have before us, has been revised and brought down to date by his son-in-law, Professor Haumant of the Sorbonne. Though of meagre proportions, this volume helps to fill the gap which confronts the student wishing to learn about Russia and unable to use the Russian books.

In his revision of the book, Mr. Haumant has conformed to the plan of the original: the treatment is by topics and the book is a small volume for reference. Because of the limits of space, only the most important events in Russian history can be noted and stated in brief outline. The greater attention is given to Russia's foreign relations, so that the account of Russian internal development is necessarily much condensed. Lack of perspective is evident in the last part of the volume, the pages written by Mr. Haumant himself.

The visit of the Russian emperor to Paris in 1894 was important; it helped to cement the alliance between the two countries. But three pages on this topic, containing detailed descriptions of receptions and military reviews, would hardly seem justified, especially when only five pages were allowed in the distribution of space, for the treatment of the topic "La Révolution" (of 1905–1906). In a history of Russia it is important to note the first Peace Congress at the Hague, which was convened on Russia's initiative; but five pages are inadequate to do justice to the congress if one is going to do more than mention it, and are out of proportion in a book of this size, covering the whole course of Russian history. Mr. Haumant's work heretofore has lain along the line of literature.

The summaries of recent problems and events are excellent. Of especial interest are the sections on the Balkans. The writer takes pains to follow the Near-Eastern question as it found reaction in Russia. Pan-Slavic sentiment in Russia was greatly weakened by the breaking up of the Balkan League, and by the conflict between Servia and Bulgaria. He points out that this was unfortunate both for Russia and for the Triple Entente; a Balkan League would have been an important factor for the balance of power in Europe.

In his treatment of recent Russian internal politics, the author takes

the view of the moderate liberal. He points out the many anomalies of the present situation, the continuation of the system and methods of administration of the old régime. The recent "nationalist" movement in Russia, which in many of its manifestations has come to represent reaction, is well analyzed and criticized. The political movement of 1905–1906 failed to secure civil and political rights as they are understood in western Europe. But as Mr. Haumant makes clear, there has been undoubted progress in the direction of liberty and a constitutional order. The Duma has had to suffer considerable curtailment of its powers, which were not as full as the Russian public had demanded; it has not been representative in any large sense, and has therefore at times found little support among the broader masses of the people. But by its very existence the Duma has had a great moral influence "which could not be either suppressed or replaced".

SAMUEL N. HARPER.

La Guerre des Balkans et l'Europe, 1912–1913. Par GABRIEL HANOTAUX. [Études Diplomatiques, deuxième série.] (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1914. Pp. vi, 457.)

THESE studies were written for French newspapers and periodicals during the grave crisis of the Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913, and consist of a discussion, from the standpoint of the diplomat, of the issues which presented themselves before the bar of the great powers and which were either solved and dismissed, or, after the more usual diplomatic fashion, adjourned to a more auspicious date and, in the meanwhile, ordered to be confined with their many restless predecessors in the international lockup. Reviewing always the most recent events—the strictly fresh, one is tempted to call them in the phrase of the butter-and-eggs merchants—the author gives us an informed, vigorous, and professionally circumspect analysis of each new situation as it affects the Triple Entente or the Triple Alliance and this or that member of these two great groups. In spite of keen penetration and great breadth of judgment he has, when all is said, presented us with a volume that belongs to the realm of journalism rather than to that of history. For it is the function of journalism to record the swift and instantaneous impressions of one who lives in the noisy centre of events, while history cultivates a deliberate method based on wide investigation and conducted in Olympian withdrawal from the strife of parties and of individuals. Mr. Hanotaux in the course of his volume considers everything that a close diplomatic student, such as he, had forced on his attention in the period involved— the rise of Bulgaria, Germans versus Slavs, Albania, the rôle of Rumania, etc.—and although his offering, when first brewed and served, was undoubtedly a cup of sparkling vintage, it has, one is in all frankness obliged to admit, already lost much of its life and in another half-year will certainly become quite flat and stale. Journalism, even though it be, as we have been assured, only a little more ephemeral than history, can expect no other fate.

The most interesting contribution of this book is what it reveals of the political psychology of the modern European diplomat. Mr. Hanotaux, as the world has not forgotten, has given his country many years of honorable and successful service and, though probably in gifts and acquisitions considerably above the average man in his profession, may still be taken as a fair specimen of the present-day *homo diplomaticus*. In reading through his book and feeling for the man behind the text the thing that constantly strikes the attention is that two opposed and struggling souls inhabit his body: a European soul, so to speak, which encourages him to take a large and generous viewpoint enveloping the good of all the people of Europe, and an underlying and old-fashioned French patriotic soul which desires the advantage of France at all costs and sees in every progress of a rival a blow aimed at the land of his special love. The novelty in this complicated mentality is the European over-soul, and that the French ex-diplomat has developed such an indwelling spirit is an encouraging sign of the times.

If the system of balance represented by the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance has any moral meaning, it must be found in just this growing European consciousness from which should spring an increasing respect shared by people and diplomats for every nation, large and small, of the European world. When in these studies the French patriot asserts himself, suspicion, jealousy, and ill-will are not unlikely to cloud the author's judgment and obscure his outlook, but when the European, prompted by his new vision, raises his voice, the reader receives the comforting assurance that, in spite of the constant threat of war, yes, in spite of the monstrous actual war, which, as these lines are written, has risen irrepressibly, the age of peace and good will must come at last.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Rise of the American People: a Philosophical Interpretation of American History. By Roland G. Usher, Ph.D. (New York: The Century Company. 1914. Pp. xiii, 413.)

This is not a text-book. It is not a contribution in the strict sense of the word to American history. As its sub-title implies it is an essay, designed to present to the layman rather than to the special student not merely the broad outlines of our history from the earliest days, but such social, economic, and political factors within the outlines as have, in the author's opinion, characterized the movement—a slow one, according to Professor Usher—resulting at length in the establishment of a nation, now and since the Civil War truly and consciously united. There is thought as well as some degree of passion in the essay. Its analysis is at points clever. There is a self-conscious note now and again in which

the author appears to pride himself on avoiding old-fashioned and outworn views. Nevertheless the opinions expressed and the conclusions do not rest on careful study or on intimate knowledge of historic details and the complicated elements of various situations. Throughout the volume there is a strain of exaggeration and ill-judged statement not easy to explain in an author who seeks to know things as they really were. Professor Usher's fondness for cant phrases—"in very truth", "wondrous possibilities", "vast majority", "logic of facts", "fundamental causes", "basic difficulty", and a long series of others on page after page—is sure to weary even a patient reader and mars the style, if not the substance, of the book. The essay leaves a general impression of having afforded its author an amusing pastime in a field with which he is not sufficiently familiar.

The first seventy pages of the volume, which compass the colonial epoch and form a basis for what follows, mark the bias of the author. Here he is reverting to the point of view of an older generation of writers, for he gives no careful attention to either intercolonial relations or to the growing potency of British rule over the colonies. His remarks on trade relations with the West Indies—a commercial factor of importance only recently better understood—are sometimes good. But why should he term such relations "negative" (p. 38) and then admit that they were vital to colonial welfare (p. 41)? It is his constant effort to prove that the separate colonies were to all intents and purposes independent of the mother-country from the time of settlement, whereas it has been made clear through the studies of such scholars as Professors C. M. Andrews and Herbert Osgood and Mr. G. L. Beer that British rule in America was by 1760 far from the dead letter it was once supposed to be. His misleading discussion of population in 1760 (p. 37) is weakened by his careless foot-note reference to the map in Channing's *History of the United States* (I. 510).

Two matters the significance of which he is eager to explain have attracted a large share of Professor Usher's attention: the Declaration of Independence and the sectional struggle between North and South which resulted in the Civil War. It is not unfair to say that these topics have guided his facile pen and tinged to a marked degree his thought on such subjects as colonial sovereignty, states' rights, and the ideal of nationality. The Declaration was, in his view, an "explicit affirmation of the point most important to Americans in 1776—the absolute sovereignty of the individual states over their own citizens and their complete independence of each other" (p. 119). To a foot-note (p. 341) he lightly consigns James Wilson's equally explicit denial of the soundness of any such view. Finding some evidence in colonial days of what he terms "states' rights", he snatches at various states'-rights projects which suggested disunion from the days of the Revolution to the outbreak of war in 1861, and reaches the conclusion that there could be no nation in these United States until 1865. "We shall entirely miss the

most vital fact about this story", he declares, "if we allow ourselves to assume even for an instant that anything deserving the name of nation existed in North America in 1660, in 1760, in 1789, or even in 1861. American history does not describe the life-story of a nation, nor even the development or growth of a nation, but the very birth of the nation which, as such, is still in its infancy" (p. 5). When Patrick Henry declared himself not a Virginian but an American, he proclaimed a vision, not a fact (p. 72). So likewise did Webster in his debate with Hayne (pp. 226, 345). The Civil War made us a nation. In a word Lincoln became "the father of American nationality" (p. 345).

Long since, in 1902, the late William Garrott Brown remarked: "To know the thing itself should be our study; and the right study of it is thought and passion, not research alone." Possibly some such admirable notion may have been behind the projection of this book. However that may be, the ideal remains still unaccomplished, for Professor Usher's results can be termed neither good philosophy nor careful history.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607–1688. By THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER, Ph.D. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1914. Pp. xi, 271.)

DR. WERTENBAKER'S volume is one among many proofs observable in recent years, that the history of Virginia in the seventeenth century, so long either entirely neglected, or studied only superficially, is receiving the steadily increasing attention which it deserves. He has taken the fullest advantage, not only of such invaluable collections of printed documents as Dr. Brown's *Genesis of the United States*, Dr. Tyler's *William and Mary College Quarterly*, and the *Virginia Historical Magazine*, but also of the works of the different scholars who have gone before him in the same field; and to the mass of illuminating information thus obtained, he has added the fruits of his own extensive personal researches.

The narrative is restricted to political events. It does not turn aside to enter any economic by-path; and the references to the institutional phases of the subject are always brief. Even the political survey is not a detailed one throughout. The critical periods alone are dwelt upon with something approaching amplitude.

The imperative demand for brevity and conciseness in so small a volume has resulted in several deficiencies. It has prevented the author from commenting freely on his more important facts where comment would have been appropriate, and would also have greatly increased the popular interest of the narrative; and secondly, it has left little room for presenting fully all sides of controverted questions. This is particularly noticeable in the treatment both of the minority faction in the London Company after 1619, and of the Acts of Navigation. That faction undoubtedly had some ground for their embittered opposition; and England could claim that, while the acts may have narrowed the colonial

market, they at least increased both her ability and her disposition to defend her subjects overseas.

Dr. Wertenbaker overemphasizes the supposed unhappy influence of the charter of 1606. The misfortunes that marred the first period of settlement would have occurred under the operation of any charter, however liberally and thoughtfully drafted, for they were really due to the Englishmen's complete ignorance at the start of the fundamental economic and sanitary principles of colonization, which they were so soon to learn from harsh practical experience.

Why was it that Berkeley, who failed so egregiously, and was detested by so many during his last administration, was so successful and so popular during his first? The contrast offers one of the problems of colonial history, upon which the present volume throws no satisfactory light. The author, however, does show very clearly for the first time why it was that such zealous reactionaries as the Robert Beverley of 1676 became such firm and such self-sacrificing supporters of the rights of the assembly and the people in after years.

It is a proof of Dr. Wertenbaker's ability to write history on a more ambitious scale, that the most admirable part of the present work is the only part in which he has permitted himself to enter at great length into details. The description of the Rebellion of 1676 is a complete one of every side of that dramatic movement. All the facts have been drawn from the original documents; and they are pieced together with such scholarly thoroughness and with such excellent literary skill, that it can be correctly said that the author has produced the most authoritative as well as the most interesting account of those stirring events yet written. No longer can it be asserted, as it has been by some historians of the period, that the causes of the rebellion are veiled in obscurity. They are brought out in these pages with remarkable force and vividness; and have really become more intelligible to us than the different reasons for friction which led up to the Revolution one hundred years later, although the latter movement, owing to its greater importance from every point of view, has naturally received far more attention.

PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE.

Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648–1706. Edited by GEORGE L. BURR, LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Medieval History, Cornell University. [Original Narratives of Early American History, edited by J. Franklin Jameson.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. Pp. xviii, 467.)

TWO-THIRDS of this volume, exclusive of the index, are filled with the literature of the Salem delusion alone. Substantially the same proportion of space is devoted to the writings of the Mathers, father and son, and of their courageous critic, Robert Calef. Professor Burr has evidently disposed finally of the ancient doubt whether the champion of

sanity and justice was the junior or senior Robert Calef. The facsimiles of the signatures of the two men, reproduced here (opposite p. 292), clinch the argument in favor of the father.

This collection of narratives contains several which have become very rare and even unprocurable. Among these little-known narratives are Richard Chamberlain's *Lithobolia, or the Stone-throwing Devil,* published in 1698, and relating the antics of Satan at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, sixteen years earlier; also Thomas Brattle's *Letter* about the Salem excitement in 1692; and the *Modest Inquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft,* by Rev. John Hale, minister at Beverly, written in 1697–1698, and not published until 1702, after the author's death. Mr. Hale was among the ministers who promoted the Salem trials. When his own wife was accused of witchcraft he entertained doubts and began to suspect the nature of the popular delusion. This pamphlet in either its original edition or in its only reprint prior to this one (Boston, 1771) is a great rarity.

But the greatest contribution which this volume makes to the student of witchcraft in America is the initial publication of a manuscript by Cotton Mather entitled "A Brand pluck'd out of the Burning". The "brand" was one Mercy Short of Boston whose bewilderments were sympathetically watched by Mr. Mather during the fall and winter of 1692–1693, and after his custom minutely described in this manuscript, which was circulated among his friends. It lay among the papers in possession of his family until 1814 when his granddaughter presented it with many other manuscripts to the library of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, where it is now preserved. Mr. Mather's later narrative, entitled "Another Brand pluckt out of the Burning", the story of Margaret Rule's encounters with the devil (September, 1693), was published by Robert Calef with his comments in *More Wonders of the Invisible World,* which is reproduced here; but this story of Mercy Short comes as a message direct from Cotton Mather's mouth, and reveals, if that were necessary, the positive personality of the man, his mingled erudition, simplicity, and vanity.

These narratives have been wisely so arranged as to preserve the general effect of a chronological sequence. First, the fifth chapter of Rev. Increase Mather's *Essay for the recording of Illustrious Providences* relates certain "Preternatural Happenings in New England" between 1662 and 1683.

Next follow the New York cases of Ralph and Mary Hall at Setauket (Brookhaven, Long Island) in 1665, and of Katharine Harrison of West Chester in 1670.

Chamberlain's stone-throwing devil at Portsmouth, 1682, is then introduced, and that is followed by two stories from Pennsylvania, one of 1684, the other of 1701. Cotton Mather's *Memorable Providences relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions* tells of various wiles of the Great Adversary, but chiefly of his persecution of the Goodwin children at Boston in 1688–1689.

All the rest of the volume is filled with the narrative of 1692–1693 with the exception of the last ten pages, devoted to the case of Grace Sherwood in Virginia, in 1706.

Perhaps the only prominent case of colonial witchcraft which is not represented among these narratives is the trial, or rather trials, of Mrs. Elizabeth Godman at New Haven, first in 1653 and again in 1655. The story is fully told in the records of that colony (II. 29–36, 151–152), and consequently it may have been considered as not strictly a narrative, but rather a court record.

Inasmuch as Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia are so directly identified with the stories of delusion here given, it may be proper to remind the reader of a fact which the arrangement of selections does not make plain, that before the outbreak at Salem, the largest number of accusations of witchcraft had been made among the settlers of what is now Connecticut, and that the rulers of New Haven evinced, in such circumstances, a spirit of unusual moderation and common sense. The first victim of this superstition in New England was Alse Young, hanged at Hartford, May 26, 1647.[1] Professor Burr embodies this fact in a foot-note on page 408, but the name of the sufferer is not in the index, which in general is admirably thorough. On page xvii of the introduction it will be observed that in the parenthetical reference to "pp. 247 ff.", the number should be 255 ff.

Professor Burr's editing is all that could be desired. The notes are copious, accurate, and illuminating wherever light is needed. The student who joins these narratives to the records printed in Upham's *Salem Witchcraft,* Woodward's *Records of Salem Witchcraft,* and in the brilliant discussions of A. C. Goodell and G. H. Moore, will have before him the materials for a fairly complete history of New England witchcraft delusions.

Professor Burr intimates, moreover, that when the publication, *Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County,* now appearing under the able editorship of Mr. George Francis Dow, reaches the era of the frenzy of 1692–1693, all the documents that exist concerning the delusion in Salem and vicinity will be put in print in that work.

C. H. Levermore.

Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675–1699. Edited by Charles H. Lincoln, Ph.D. [Original Narratives of Early American History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. Pp. xii, [1], 316.)

There are seven reprints in this volume on the Indian wars of New England from 1675 to 1699; being a selection of the rare Indian narratives sedulously sought for by collectors. No. 1 is *A Relacion of the*

[1] Between this event and the last indictment in Connecticut in 1697 there were in that colony 28 accusations of witchcraft and 9 executions. The last execution was that of Mary Barnes of Farmington in 1663.

Indyan Warre, by Mr. Easton, of Roade Isld., 1675, from the original manuscript in the New York State Library. It was first printed at Albany, in 1858, in an edition of one hundred copies, edited by Franklin B. Hough. No. 2 is *The Present State of New-England with Respect to the Indian War* (London, 1675). The imprint date is old style and the tract was actually published early in 1676. In no. 3 we have *A Continuation* (London, 1676), and in no. 4, *A New and Further Narrative* (London, 1676). Nos. 2–4 are by "N. S.", believed to be Nathaniel Saltonstall. There are two issues of no. 4, textually alike, but with varying title-pages. No. 5 is Richard Hutchinson's *The Warr in New-England visibly ended* (London, 1677). The first reprints of nos. 2 and 3 were published by Samuel G. Drake, in 1833, but the sale was unsuccessful. As far as possible, Drake recalled the edition, and, in 1836, used the remainder of these two pieces, added reprints of nos. 4 and 5, and *A True Account of the most Considerable Occurrences* (London, 1676); and appended his compilation of *Chronicles of the Indians of America*—a chronological dictionary of Indian events. The 1836 edition was limited to "some 250 Copies". In 1867 Drake brought out a new edition with additions, but omitted the *Chronicles* as out of date. This edition contains reprints of nos. 2–5; also *A True Account, News from New-England* (London, 1673); and *A farther brief and true Narrative* (London, 1676). The last two pieces had not been reprinted before.

The volume under review has taken nos. 2–5 from Drake's edition of 1867. The general editor states (note, p. vii) concerning these: "The text of them presented in Drake's *Old Indian Chronicle,* which has all the appearance of close conformity to the originals, was taken as printer's copy. Collation with the rare originals was not practicable at the time when the book was prepared. When the opportunity for it was secured, it was discovered too late that Drake's text differed very widely from his originals in capitalization, and sometimes varied from them in spelling. But though correction of all these differences had become impracticable, all significant errors have been corrected." The reviewer has during a period of twenty years noticed the same aberrations from originals in all of Drake's reprints which he has tested. He is able to state that Drake's 1836 edition, while not exact, conforms more nearly to the originals than the 1867 edition. He has compared no. 5 in the present work with the original edition; has found over one hundred variations in capitalization, spelling, and punctuation, but nothing that affects historical accuracy of statement.

The sixth piece is Mrs. Mary Rowlandson's *Narrative* of her captivity (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1682), second and earliest extant edition. It is reprinted from the excessively rare original in the Prince collection of the Boston Public Library. A facsimile, from plates indifferently done, was edited, in 1903, by Henry S. Nourse and John E. Thayer. The seventh and last piece is Cotton Mather's *Decennium*

Luctuosum (1688 to 1698), reprinted from the nearly unique original (Boston, 1699) in the Boston Public Library, which has only a pen and ink title-page; but the present reprint omits Mather's sermon on "Observable Things" as not worth while. Mather himself reprinted the *Decennium* in his *Magnalia* (London, 1702), and it is also in the reprinted editions of that *magnum opus,* of 1820 and 1853.

The composite volume of *Narratives of the Indian Wars* has useful introductions and textual, personal, geographical, elucidative, and critical annotations that are valuable. The original Winthrop manuscripts in the Massachusetts Historical Society are rich in unprinted information on King Philip's War and the editor of this volume would have found in them the answers to some of his uncertainties. The information from Hennepin, which the editor could not locate in that author (p. 216, note 2), is from the *New Discovery* (ch. XXXVI., see Thwaites's edition, II. 590 ff.). A facsimile of the "White Hills" issue of the "Map of New-England" from the Boston edition, 1677, of Hubbard's *Narratives of the Troubles with the Indians,* is the frontispiece and principal reproduction presented. The volume has a good index.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

Athanase de Mézières and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1768–1780. Documents published for the first time, from the original Spanish and French manuscripts, chiefly in the archives of Mexico and Spain; translated into English; edited and annotated by HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON, Ph.D., Professor of American History, University of California. In two volumes. (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company. 1914. Pp. 351; 392.)

ROMANCE and diplomatic controversy have made prominent the deeds of La Salle and St. Denis on the early Louisiana-Texas frontier. The present publication is designed to do the same for a third Frenchman, whose active career belongs to the period when Louisiana was transferred to Spanish control. De Mézières facilitated this transfer, worked to attach the Indians to the new Spanish régime, explored the debatable ground between Louisiana and Texas, favored reciprocal commerce between the two provinces, and proposed measures to develop their common resources, control the Indians, and repel the advances of the drèaded English. Loyal to his native country, he so gained the confidence of his new superiors that they proposed to transfer him from Natchitoches to the governorship of Texas.

These facts and a wealth of similar data for the history of both provinces we may gather from these two substantial volumes, which may be regarded as a by-product of the Carnegie Institution, the universities of Texas and California, and the Bureau of American Ethnology. Professor Bolton combines the results of labors in these three fields, although emphasizing the last named, and utilizes as well the

publications of fellow-workers (some of them his students), to whom he makes generous acknowledgment. The work initiates a series to be known as *Spain in the West,* and the publishers have brought it out in a form worthy of their established reputation.

The brief preface is followed by an "Historical Introduction" of over a hundred pages that for the casual reader will constitute the most valuable feature of the work. The major portion of this is devoted to classifying and locating the Indian tribes of Texas and vicinity, during which the editor makes extensive use of data previously gathered for the Bureau of Ethnology. He describes French and Spanish efforts to control the Indians during the first century of contact, and the Spanish attempts to prevent contraband trade with the natives and with Santa Fé. With the transfer of Louisiana to Spain, that nation introduces a new Indian policy, and at the same time proposes to change the form of government for its frontier provinces. This policy is designed to secure the allegiance of the tribes newly brought under Spanish control; and to do so, the authorities plan to expel renegade creoles and intrusive Englishmen, regulate trade and inter-tribal relations, and assist, wherever possible, in civilizing the natives. De Mézières was a most fitting agent for this task, and the latter part of the introduction is devoted to a sketch of his career from 1769 to 1779, when he was thus engaged.

The documents, fifty-two in number, are largely from the Archivo General of Mexico, the Archivo General of Seville, the Archivo Historico Nacional of Madrid, and the Bancroft Collection, with two from the British Museum and one each from the Bexar Archives and the archives of the diocese of San Antonio, Texas. They are grouped in ten divisions, suggested by the Frenchman's manifold activities, and throw great light upon the contemporary political, social, and economic conditions of that frontier area. The portion printed does not include all the material relating to De Mézières, and the editor confesses that the task of selection has been a difficult one. One who feels overwhelmed by the mass of facts presented by the text and foot-notes, may be reassured by the carefully prepared index of more than fifty pages. This is doubly useful because the editor groups all variant spellings of Indian and other proper names and makes frequent cross-references. A good-sized map of Texas and the neighboring territory forms the frontispiece of the first volume. This is compiled from original data and shows the position of different tribal groups during the eighteenth century, together with settlements, missions, presidios, explorers' routes, and ordinary highways. A few signatures and one page of a report are given in facsimile.

Despite the abundant opportunity for errata, few are noted. Some in the first volume are corrected in the second. In addition typographical errors occur in volume I., page 84, where "1769" should obviously be 1760; on page 125, where the figures of the date "1777–5" should be transposed; and on page 127, note 152, where the Spanish form

"Sevilla" is used instead of the English. The reviewer notes that the titles of two articles cited in note 23, page 33, are not quite accurate. In the second volume, "volume I.", should be inserted in note 271, page 234. In general, however, one cannot speak too highly of the care and scholarship displayed by the editor in his task, and one will await with interest the appearance of succeeding volumes in a series that promises so much for the history of the Southwest.

ISAAC JOSLIN COX.

Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois. Herausgegeben von JULIUS GOEBEL. [Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter, Jahrgang 1913, vol. XIII.] (Chicago: the Society. 1914. Pp. 359.)

THE present *Jahrbuch,* the second under the editorship of Professor Goebel, contains a well-sifted collection of studies and materials, without exception important and interesting. The first, by I. E. Voigt, is a welcome study of the life and works of "Talvj". This mystifying pseudonym, composed of the initials of her name, was used by Therese A. L. von Jakob, whose brilliant mind was a quickening force in Germany and America during the first half of the nineteenth century. She was the daughter of a German professor of philosophy at Charkov, at St. Petersburg, and at Halle. In 1826 Edward Robinson, instructor in Hebrew at Andover Seminary, came to Halle to study under Gesenius, and at the house of Professor von Jakob he met Therese, who became his wife in 1828. She came to America well fitted for active participation in the intellectual advancement of her adopted country. When her husband founded the *Biblical Repository* in 1831 (continued as the *Bibliotheca Sacra* since 1843), and made it the chief exponent of German theological and philosophical thought, his wife proved an able assistant, translating and interpreting the numerous German contributions to the review. Mr. Robinson became a pioneer and authority in the geography of the Bible; Talvj translated his work into German in 1853–1854. But this assistance by no means excluded independent literary effort. Admirable and sound is her best historical work (1847), *Geschichte der Colonisation von Neu-England, 1607–1692,* sympathetic, yet unbiassed and discerning. Novels depicting contemporary life, translations (as of Pickering's book concerning the languages of the American Indians, with annotations by Talvj), poems, and essays, flowed from her pen; she was an esteemed contributor to leading American and German magazines; and her personal influence was great during the period 1837–1863, when her husband was professor of Biblical literature at Union Theological Seminary in New York, and her home was the resort of men of letters and learning, and of students who sought inspiration and instruction. The second number in the *Jahrbuch* is a carefully written article by Albert J. W. Kern, on Jacob Leisler. This is followed by "Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte der Massenauswanderung im Jahre

1709", by the editor, Julius Goebel. These documents, from the archives of the principality Nassau-Weilburg, besides throwing light on economic and social conditions of the period, prove that English agents gave encouragement to German emigrants (as here Mr. Davenant, English envoy at Frankfort-on-the-Main), and that history must throw a large part of the responsibility upon them for the large exodus of Palatines in 1709–1710, whose numbers caused embarrassment in London for some time. "The Germans of Iowa and the Two-Year Amendment of Massachusetts", by F. J. Herriott, is an important contribution to our knowledge of the bearing of the German vote of the Middle West upon the political situation in the crisis of 1860. Mr. Herriott shows that the leaders of the Republican party in Iowa considered the German vote indispensable for victory at the polls, adopting every expedient to reassure and satisfy the German leaders, and nominating the most influential of the Germans of Iowa, the "forty-eighter" N. J. Rusch, as lieutenant-governor in 1860; and he narrates their struggle to counteract the effect of the Two-Year Amendment passed by the Republicans of Massachusetts, by which the foreigner after becoming naturalized should be compelled to wait two years before securing the privilege of voting. The last article, "Aus dem Tagebuch eines Achtundvierzigers", we owe to Professor Otto Heller, who encouraged Dr. Enno Sander, an ardent participant in the revolution of 1848–1849, to look back and dictate to him what he remembered of that period of great hopes, of slight fulfillment, yet of great moment for its bearing upon the future. The diary is written in a racy style, and gives a fascinating picture of persons and events in that brief, but critical struggle, which sent practically all of its surviving leaders to this country.

A. B. Faust.

Guide to the Materials in London Archives for the History of the United States since 1783. By Charles O. Paullin, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and Frederic L. Paxson, Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin. (Washington, D. C.: The Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1914. Pp. xi, 642.)

This volume, which does honor to the Carnegie Institution, to the Director of its Department of Historical Research, and to its compilers, is a joint production. Dr. Paullin of the Institution contributed six months to the work and Professor Paxson of the University of Wisconsin three months; and Professor Fryer of McGill University and Mr. Parker, now of the Archives Department, Ottawa, assisted materially. The labor was divided as well as possible, however, and great care was taken to minimize the disadvantages of division. The *Guide,* which extends in nearly all cases to 1860, covers the Foreign Office, Home Office, War Office, Colonial Office, Privy Council, House

of Lords, Admiralty, Audit Office, Board of Trade, Customs, General Post Office, High Court of Admiralty, the Treasury, and the British Museum manuscripts. Of the value of these documents it cannot be necessary to speak at length. The diplomatic despatches, for instance, were from men of ability close to the heart of things, exempt in many cases from the blinding passions of the participants and under a stringent obligation to observe carefully and write with scrupulous fidelity; and all the papers possess in their varying degrees and for their various purposes a substantial importance. The field is almost appalling in extent, while the labor of reporting upon it was very exacting in regard to quality; and the compilers merit hearty praise for the patient and scholarly work accomplished. The reviewer has been able to compare transcripts and notes—particularly from "F. O. America" and "F. O. Mexico" papers—with the analyses of the corresponding volumes presented in the *Guide,* and also to test less thoroughly the Admiralty work, and, besides finding himself almost always satisfied, has in many cases felt admiration at the deftness as well as fidelity with which the documents have been handled. A dozen words often represent hours of thoughtful labor. At the same time it must be said—not as a criticism upon the compilers but as a hint to the users of the volume—that it has its limitations. This was indeed practically inevitable. It had to be prepared with a moderate expenditure of time and printed within a moderate compass; and there are bounds to both human knowledge and the human power of attention. Cases have been found in which pertinent matters have been passed over, and others in which the descriptions are somewhat inadequate or possibly somewhat misleading. These have arisen occasionally perhaps from an oversight or from failing to perceive all the bearings of a document or passage, as only a special student of the subject could fairly be expected to do; but usually the cause has doubtless been the need of conciseness. Moreover it was found impracticable (see p. 10) to try to list all of the documents relating to the United States that are scattered through series relating primarily to other countries; and the preface states that "many series of documents are not described", though the indexes, catalogues, and official lists referring to them are fully mentioned. Hence while scores of papers having apparently only a very slight importance are specified, some of notable value—especially those preserved in files where one would not expect to find them—might be overlooked by the investigator, should he rely too closely on the *Guide.* Now the failure of an historian to use essential documents is peculiarly unfortunate, for it is less likely to be detected than misstatements yet quite as liable to cause wrong conclusions. For this reason whatever seems to be a satisfactory substitute for the tedious examination of all the possible sources is of course dangerous, and the suggestion must be made not to use the *Guide* blindly, however great its value. The inquirer must still be alert, persistent, and laborious, and so Dr. Jameson himself intimates in his

excellent preface. To these remarks must be added strong appreciation of the introduction—which offers much essential preliminary information to the scholar wishing to consult these archives—and of the fine index.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

Writings of John Quincy Adams. Edited by WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD. Volume III., 1801–1810. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxiv, 555.)

THE third installment of John Quincy Adams's *Writings* covers what was perhaps the most critical period in his long public career. Immediately upon his return from Prussia he entered political life. In April, 1802, he was elected a member of the senate of Massachusetts; in November, he narrowly missed an election to the federal House of Representatives; in the following February, he was elected to the United States Senate. Chosen to represent a Federalist constituency, he did not hesitate to support measures recommended by President Jefferson. For this independent course he paid the inevitable penalty. The trials which befell him were, he admitted to his mother, severe beyond any that he ever was before called to meet. In June, 1808, he found himself so hopelessly at odds with his constituents that he resigned his seat. A year later he was appointed minister to Russia by President Madison.

The personal history unfolded in these letters will be familiar to those who have read Adams's *Diary*; yet many phases of personal politics are illuminated by passages written in a confidential vein. Occasionally, too, information of a general nature may be gleaned from these letters; but on the whole they contribute little that is new to the history of the times.

Those who would understand what Josiah Quincy called "the peculiar texture" of Adams's mind will do well to read the letters which passed between him and the overseers of Harvard College relative to the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory. Adams was convinced that "the bar was not his element", but he never doubted his ability to contribute to "belles lettres". Conscientious to a fault in this as in all matters, he read laboriously in the classics, in preparation for his duties; yet he never exhibited any marked literary taste or imagination. On witnessing an eclipse of the moon his fancy took no higher flight than this: "The fowls roosted. The lowing herd wound slowly o'er the lea. The western horizon with a sky perfectly serene looked as if it had been charged with one of the heaviest thunder clouds. The moon appeared like a patch of court plaister upon the face of Heaven."

On the other hand, Adams did entertain serious doubts as to his usefulness in public life. His fundamental principles, he declared, were devotion to the Union and independence of party obligations. He deplored at all times the baneful influence of party. Referring to his

break with the Federalists of Massachusetts, he wrote in a short autobiographical sketch, "I discharged my duty to my country, but I committed the unpardonable sin against *Party*." Yet in almost the same breath he remarked, with a flash of self-scrutiny, "Perhaps I have too much indulged the suggestions of my own judgment, and paid too little deference to that of other men." The future biographer of Adams will hardly venture to deny this soft impeachment.

The work of the editor has been on the whole well done, although it seems at times less complete than in the earlier volumes. Here and there references to events are suffered to go without explanation. A reference, for example, to the "cause for which I came here", in a letter from Washington, March 5, 1809, can be made intelligible, of course, by turning to the *Memoirs*; but the casual reader perhaps will not know that this was the important case of Fletcher *v.* Peck, in which Adams appeared as counsel for the defendant. So, too, an allusion to the decision of Judge Davis in the district court at Salem in 1809 deserves a brief foot-note, for the case was an important test of the constitutionality of the embargo. Two slight errors have been noted. The editor prints *Porte Folio* as a single word, though neither Adams nor the editor of the periodical did so. Breckenridger (p. 159) is an obvious slip for Breckenridge.

ALLEN JOHNSON.

Bull Run: its Strategy and Tactics. By R. M. JOHNSTON. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1913. Pp. xiv, 293.)

IF it is well to resurrect the story of the Bull Run campaign, then we must bear witness that this book gives a good narrative of events as they occurred; that the account has been verified by a study of the ground, that well-known sources of information have been consulted, and that conflicting stories have been fairly decided.

But Bull Run races will probably not be run again, and the event loses much of its interest as it ceases to be a lesson. Its three months' volunteers will parade no more upon the page of American history to furnish examples of panic rout, vain sacrifice, and the frivolity of the armed crowd. In the art of command from high to low, never again shall we see the unhappy tactics of Sherman and Heintzelman or the empty orders of McDowell and Beauregard. Our volunteer army bill has changed the one, and lieutenants are now so well dosed with the subject of military orders and the attack over open ground, that it has been feared that they know too much, not too little.

However if we must draw these shadows from their long repose we should bear in mind the wisdom of our later day. When we summon the soldiers of 1861 to appear before the bar of history let us take account of the state of military art as it was known to them. Let us give to McDowell and Beauregard a chance to reply that Napoleon the Great

at Wagram, at Auerstädt, at Ligny or Charleroi could be convicted of the same faults. The criticism of the author might be more gentle.

It is good practice for writers on strategy and tactics to define their meaning for these much-abused terms. The campaign abounds with curious if obsolete questions of tactics and strategy, not always stated as such, but hidden in the mass of narrative. The word tactics is not often used and further elucidation would be interesting in such matters as these: When artillery was used in "searching" woods and positions, apparently with approval of the author; something might be added to the discussion of the tactics of attack and defense when we know from the author's figures that McDowell crossed Bull Run with enough men to line the Warrenton pike from Stone Bridge to Dogan's house at six to the yard, and Beauregard had enough men in action to stand at nine to the yard from Robinson's to Henry's and on to Chinn's; and what of the position of Jackson on the reverse slope of the fire-swept zone, not on the military crest—a tactical expedient often noticed in this war, and quite opposed to theory; the field of fire of the Federal guns on Henry Hill; the negative results of superior artillery (regulars) against "Shanks" Evans's smooth-bores; the effect of Imboden's smooth-bores at Henry Hill. The author uses the word "strategy" with frequency, and thereby adds to our curiosity, for it is a recent word, not over seventy years old in our language, not used in its French form by Napoleon himself but greatly overworked by his commentators. Perhaps the best idea comes from Kipling's statement, "The essence of strategy is forethought." Under such a view, however, the book would condemn as "weak in strategy" the leader who shows its best example. When the North had 80,000 men available in West Virginia and Virginia, and the South had less than half that number, it would appear to be strategy to concentrate a superior Southern force against the largest Federal fraction. The plan seems to have belonged to Beauregard more than to any other.

With strategy as our theme we miss a strategic study of the frontier and a discussion of the influence of localities (capitals). If McDowell had used forethought he would not have put in front the troops which had the shortest march to make; he would have made crossings over the insignificant Cub Run, instead of marching 18,000 men over the narrow defile at the bridge, behind which he passed two whole days; he would have foreseen that 12,000 men marching on a country road at one man to the yard would take hours to form for attack.

Among brilliant reviews of Bull Run is one which has not been noticed by the author. Colonel John S. Mosby in the New York *Sun* reminds us that Ashby's cavalry joined from the valley on the day after the battle, making say 25,000 cavalry; that the cavalry was sufficient to have completely demoralized the retreat, crossed at Seneca Ford, fifteen miles from Washington, and cut it off from the north. Colonel Mosby contends that McDowell's order was what the Southern generals were

praying for, and did not take advantage of when they found it had been issued; that at 4:00 p. m. the Southern generals were six miles nearer Washington than the beaten armies of the North.

The author anticipates the development of field intrenchments when he charges Beauregard with neglect to do what Lee did not do at Antietam.

Some carelessness is shown in omitting scales and compass bearings from some maps and in such statements as that "Arlington was the property of Robert E. Lee", and the remark and foot-note on page 93 from which it would appear that Major Palmer commanded a battalion of cavalry consisting of sixteen squadrons, each squadron of half a company. Palmer commanded two squadrons, and bivouacked at Centerville on the night of July 21. Bull Run is referred to as a river.

EBEN SWIFT.

The United States Federal Internal Tax History from 1861 to 1871. By HARRY EDWIN SMITH, Ph.D. [Hart, Schaffner, and Marx Prize Essays.] (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xix, 357.)

To this book was awarded the first prize presented by Messrs. Hart, Schaffner, and Marx for the year 1912. It is a very valuable contribution to our economic history. It contains the best history of the income tax legislation during our Civil War that has hitherto been published. This is high praise, since the subject had been previously treated by Professor Seligman. The author (at p. 87) joins issue, with apparent success, upon the latter's statement that the repeal of the income tax was defeated in the Forty-First Congress by the vote of 105 to 104 (Seligman's *Income Tax*, first ed., p. 467).

In the book are also to be found the Congressional, administrative, and judicial histories of the inheritance tax, the tax on the gross receipts of corporations, bank taxes, stamp taxes, license taxes, liquor taxes, taxes upon manufactures, and other internal revenue taxes during the same period. It shows research not only through the *Congressional Globe* and Congressional documents, but also in the records of the departments and the files of the leading New York newspapers. It also explains many of the rulings by the commissioner of internal revenue, which are of importance not only as the practical construction of the statutes, but also as showing the reasons for some of the subsequent amendments. Annexed is a valuable series of tables, collected from Executive and Congressional documents, which are not easily accessible. No one, whether scholar or statesman, upon whom is imposed the duty of investigating any of these or cognate subjects, can afford to overlook the book.

The style is drier than the exigencies of the subject require. The work contains a number of awkward expressions, such as are unfor-

tunately not uncommon in the theses of our recent college graduates, and which may be due to the recent neglect of the study of the classics.

The only notable omission is the history of the Whiskey Ring. This is treated with unnecessary abbreviation. If adequately and judiciously set forth, it would have made the work less weary to the reader, and the author would have rendered an important service by showing how well founded were the charges made in contemporary publications and in the courts as to the implication of some of the highest and most influential officers in the United States in the conspiracy. He would have furnished valuable and interesting material for the histories of the cities of New York and St. Louis.

We can find no reference to the dispute as to the constitutionality of the cotton tax imposed during the Civil War, which was attacked as a duty upon exports; nor to the Treasury fee of four cents a pound charged for a license to buy cotton then in a state that had joined in the Confederacy and to transport the same into a loyal state. This, although in its effect similar to a tax and not imposed by Congress, was sustained by the Supreme Court in Hamilton *v.* Dillon (21 Wall. 73, 22 L. Ed. 528).

A few errors belong to a class not unusually found in the books of laymen who discuss judicial decisions. At page 35 the writer speaks of two cases brought before the courts, which he describes as the "Georgia Case" and the "Direct Tax Case". His citations are rulings of comptrollers of the Treasury. And he omits the case of U. S. *v.* Louisiana (123 U. S. 32), decided December 24, 1887, which is in harmony with one of these comptroller's rulings.

The citations of cases in the federal, district, and circuit courts, are usually from the *Internal Revenue Record,* a periodical which few libraries contain. Had he taken the trouble to add references to the regular reports and to the reprint entitled *Federal Cases,* the author by the use of a table of cases would have expended only a few more hours of labor and he would have saved his readers much time and needless irritation. A table of the cases cited in the book would also have increased its value.

His bibliography, although it mentions Boutwell's *Manual of the Direct and Excise Tax System of the United States,* together with Bump's *Internal Revenue Statutes now in Force,* omits Foster and Abbot on the income tax of 1894. This was the only volume published before 1913 that contained the text of all the statutes and a complete digest of the decisions of the courts and the rulings by the commissioner of internal revenue upon the income taxes of the Civil War.

Confederate Portraits. By GAMALIEL BRADFORD. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xix, 291.)

HERE is a volume interesting and significant but for which the word "portraits" in the title claims too much. The claim becomes slightly pretentious through the coinage of a new term for what is done in these

essays—"psychography". The origination of a new type of expression is perhaps the rarest achievement of art and the claim to have done so inevitably challenges severe scrutiny.

Observe Mr. Bradford's method. First of all he deliberately repudiates consecutive narrative. There is no dramatic movement in his essays. The reader stands still and is bombarded by observations. One suspects that the method is based in the author's mind on a philosophical conception left over from a more metaphysical age, the conception of character not as a plastic thing forever in formation or destruction but as a predetermined substance contained in circumstance as in a vase. For people who hold such views the sequence of events is almost immaterial; what they want is a logical pattern conceived once for all with time omitted. Furthermore, Mr. Bradford makes a point of rejecting all debatable matter. Ask him whether Longstreet bungled Gettysburg and he replies, in substance, "Let us waive that; my notion of his character, from the things he said, and some of the things he did, and from what others thought of him, is so-and-so." All very well when the character involved is not problematical. Stuart, for example, will make a charming essay—as here he does—no matter what method is used nor how slight the circumstantial basis. Much the same might be said of the essays on Beauregard and Semmes. It is in the treatment of problematical subjects—in this case, J. E. Johnston, Longstreet, Benjamin, Stephens, Toombs—that the method of "psychography" meets its test. Is it better fitted than established methods to discover the strange harmony, if harmony there be, that, in such characters, underlies the discord?

A typical instance of the "psychographical" method is the essay on Stephens—who, by the way, in his several aspects, reminds us of Cicero, Voltaire, Leopardi, Amiel, even Plato, to say nothing of Byron and Galileo—and who is here pictured in a series of descriptions topically arranged without the least intimation that the sequence of his deeds is a necessary condition to relating properly his various sides. In fact, the method might be briefly described as an attempt to portray the characters of men without determining the sequence of their deeds.

One need not insist that history hitherto has not employed the psychographical method. What is more to the point, considering Mr. Bradford's general attitude, neither has literature. It is as far from Thackeray as from Gibbon. What would remain of the portrait of Mrs. Crawley if we subtracted from the causes of the effect all Thackeray's delicate care to have us perceive the exact deviation from the familiar in the curve of her conduct? It is because he has not learned this lesson that Mr. Bradford's work—pleasing as it is, and it is very pleasing—lacks force. Compare his best essay with, say, Matthew Arnold's "Falkland" or Pater's "Leonardo", and we realize that psychography is no improvement upon literature.

What then are the virtues of this volume? To begin with, the de-

lightful one of being readable—which too many books of history are not. Also its tone. In a way nothing could be more praiseworthy than the tone of cordial sympathy that pervades every essay. But the chief virtue is Mr. Bradford himself. He has a conviction, he feels it strongly and he communicates it—the conviction that personality as such, with all its inconsistencies, fanaticisms, illusions, is one of the prime historic forces. The final value of his book is not so much in its contributions toward the ultimate portraits of the Confederate leaders as in the stimulating charge of his own hearty conviction that historical portraiture is worth while. At the moment, when history seems to be reacting somewhat against the ultra-economic school, when it seems to be taking a psychological turn, Mr. Bradford may even be thought of as one of the first fruits of a new day. One may risk it that he will be read with pleasure by the late president of the Historical Association. Ought not that to content him for his labor?

N. W. Stephenson.

Contemporary American History, 1877–1913. By Charles A. Beard, Associate Professor of Politics, Columbia University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. 397.)

The scope of this book is strictly limited. "I have made no attempt to present an 'artistically balanced' account of the last thirty-five years", says the author, "but have sought rather to furnish a background for the leading issues of current politics and to enlist the interest of the student in the history of the most wonderful period in American development. The book is necessarily somewhat 'impressionistic' and in part it is based upon materials which have not been adequately sifted and evaluated. Nevertheless, I have endeavored to be accurate and fair, and at the same time to invite on the part of the student some of that free-play of the mind which Matthew Arnold has shown to be so helpful in literary criticism."

Despite this apology, we have a right to expect in a supposedly scholarly treatise a more or less balanced treatment of the period, and it is a surprise to find that the author all but neglects economic history. In two chapters, the one on the Growth of Dissent from the Civil War to 1896, the other on the Revival of Dissent after the Spanish War, there is no treatment of the financial panics of 1873, 1893, and 1907. One searches in vain for a consideration of such important subjects as the increase in the supply of gold, the rise of prices, and the slower rise of wages. The development of the West is presented merely as a matter of growth of population and formation of new states, with no discussion of the Indian question, the disposition of the public lands, and the enormous increase in the volume of the crops, and very little on the conservation movement, while for the country at large foreign and domestic commerce, and mining and lumbering, are totally neglected.

Apparently Professor Beard believes that to furnish his "background" he may safely disregard these fundamental factors, and that in the consideration which he gives to the formation of labor unions, the question of free silver, and the development of the trusts he has given adequate attention to economic movements. Perhaps here we should recognize the "impressionistic" character of the book, to which the author himself confesses, and his invitation to students to exercise "that free play of the mind", helpful in literary criticism.

Diplomatic history also is largely ignored, even such episodes as dollar diplomacy and the rise and progress of Pan-Americanism not being deemed "elementary facts" of importance. Twenty-seven pages cover the history of parties and party issues from 1877 to 1896, a chapter of thirty-five pages is devoted to the single campaign of 1896, and another chapter, slightly larger, to the campaign of 1912. Aside from this disproportionate allotment of space, however, the political chapters are well done, though somewhat loosely written. In the treatment of federal legislation lies the real strength of the book. The chapters of greatest value are those on the Revolution in Politics and Law, the Growth of Dissent, and the Revival of Dissent, but the last two of these are, as we have seen, weak on the economic side.

The almost total absence of foot-notes is unfortunate, for it not only deprives the reader of access to the author's sources of information, which he would like to "sift" for himself, but also adds to the "impressionistic" nature of the book. Sweeping generalizations, without facts or arguments in their defense, some of them open to serious question, to say the least, are numerous. Thus we are told that the discontent of the two decades, 1876 to 1896, was confined principally to the small farmers (p. 147), that the American people enjoy wars beyond measure (p. 199), that Great Britain was wholly in the right in her boundary dispute with Venezuela (p. 202), that economic interests led to intervention in Cuba (p. 204), and that the acquisition of the Philippines was simply an episode in the development of commercial interests in the Orient (p. 224).

The apparently hasty and ill-considered use of material may be due to the rapid appearance of the author's publications, but we are forced to the conclusion that his *Contemporary American History,* while valuable and stimulating in many respects, good in spots, is poorly grounded, unauthoritative, and far too restricted in point of view. Unless used with discrimination, it cannot furnish a true "background" to contemporary politics and government.

The Americans in the Philippines: a History of the Conquest and First Years of Occupation, with an introductory Account of the Spanish Rule. By James A. LeRoy. With an Introduction by William Howard Taft. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xi, 424; 350.)

The ardent and gifted writer of this posthumous work was a graduate of the University of Michigan of the class of 1896. He was a newspaper writer in 1900 when the opportunity came to go to the Philippines as a private secretary with the Taft Commission. He was invalided home in 1902 and later appointed American consul at Durango, Mexico. He died at Fort Bayard in 1909. Thus the space of his actual participation in Philippine affairs was brief, but the spell of the great and fascinating task which the United States had undertaken in that archipelago held him completely to the last days of his life. His service with the commission and his keen reporter's instinct for what was news promptly gave him a remarkable grasp upon the movements of Filipino thought and ambition, but this knowledge, drawn from first-hand acquaintance with the leaders of that people, was supplemented and enriched by assiduous study of Spanish colonial history and exhaustive examination of official and personal records. This is sufficiently indicated in the work under review. No other writer on the Philippines has exhibited any such wide acquaintance with both the Spanish and English sources of information upon the history of recent decades in the Philippines. The admirable foot-notes which abound disclose many sources of information, especially Spanish and native, unknown to the ordinary writer. This book, which was to be the culmination of his work in behalf of Philippine scholarship, appears some five or six years since his busy mind last reviewed it and has been prepared for press by other hands, yet its timeliness at the present moment and its permanent value to the history of the Philippines cannot be disputed. It is by far the ablest and most just account which has so far appeared upon the American possession of the Philippines. The charge of partizanship brought by one hasty reviewer cannot be maintained. Throughout the recital of the controverted matters which this work covers, the author has held the just and even balance of a thoroughly historical mind.

The work divides into two parts. The first and the briefer is a summary of Spanish achievements. In the first forty pages the old régime is reviewed in its social and economic features: the state of culture of the Filipinos before the conquest, the work of the friar-missionaries and the controversies arising from their position, the reform efforts following the English occupation of Manila made by Anda, Basco y Vargas, and Archbishop Santa Justa y Rufina, the development of foreign commerce, and the changes brought by the admission of Filipinos to contact with the outside world. This summary recalls the introduc-

tory chapter written by the late Professor Bourne for Blair and Robertson's *Philippine Islands*. With much less historic detail, its final judgments have the advantage of being written from a first-hand acquaintance, and while less complimentary to Spanish achievement, are distinctly more convincing. The two following chapters deal with the reform effort made by Spanish Liberals from 1860 onwards, the repeated check of this liberal movement, the reactionary part played by the religious orders and the development of the spirit of revolt in the people. This is an extremely important historical episode. What Spanish power in the Philippines faced between 1860 and 1896, other colonial powers must face at some time in the future. The lessons of Spain's failure need to be written very large for the instruction of the present century. Only a monumental work devoted to this period will fully satisfy historical requirements but Mr. LeRoy's chapters furnish an excellent introduction. Some criticisms however may be made. His estimate of the Filipino population of the islands at the time of the conquest is from one to two and a half millions and is certainly an overstatement. The numbers brought under the conquerors for the first hundred years scarcely rose above a half million. Outside of these the Moros and pagan wild peoples could have represented only a few hundreds of thousands at most. In his narration of social conditions under Spain the author has been much influenced by Rizal, whose novels he had thoroughly perused. His account of this remarkable man is just but he commits what was once a common error in calling him a full-blood Tagalog. The recent investigations of Mr. Austin Craig into the lineage of Rizal show him to have been nearly half Chinese, with a strain of Spanish and Ilokano inheritance as well as Tagalog. For this period the writer used also the excellent works of Mas and Jagor, the publications of Retana, the periodical, *La Política de España en Filipinas,* and personal narratives of Spanish life in the Philippines. Diligently as these have been employed, their sum is not enough to reconstruct the life of the islands previous to 1898. Only as the younger generation of Filipino students now appearing set their hands to collecting the materials for Philippine life in the pre-American period will a comprehensive and fully sympathetic knowledge be gained of what that life was.

The major portion of the work is an account of the American occupation from the battle of Manila Bay to the second election of Mr. McKinley, a period of two and a half years. As a careful consecutive narration of a brief but most important period it fills a real need. The battle of Manila Bay and the capture of Manila have been described from the military standpoint by Admiral Chadwick in his *Spanish War,* and Mr. Worcester has recently traversed the subject of early relations between Americans and Filipinos, the dictatorial government and the responsibility for hostilities, but his writing is based almost wholly on Captain Taylor's *Philippine Insurgent Records,* while Mr. LeRoy not only employed these records but also used exhaustively the American

reports and Congressional documents, the Spanish accounts, the *Defensas* of Blanco, Primo de Rivera, Montojo, and Nozaleda, the histories of the revolution by Sastrón, Father Martinez, and other Spaniards, the Filipino revolutionary papers *La Independencia* and *Heraldo de la Revolución,* and the personal experiences recounted to him by Filipinos active in the affairs of this period. Here again time will give us, let it be hoped, much more of the Filipino side, especially descriptions of what took place in provinces and towns under Filipino rule, but for the present and until the Filipino himself becomes articulate through the production of a native group of historical writers trained to some degree of impartiality, Mr. LeRoy's work embodies nearly all the information that is available to the historian. It is this that makes it indispensable to the serious student of history and of colonial government, superior to anything that has yet appeared and far above the recent works of Blount and Worcester, not only in the range of materials employed, but in judicial tone and convincing power.

Something should be said of the orthography of Filipino names employed by Mr. LeRoy. It follows in the main the reforms which the Filipinos themselves have adopted and which date from the linguistic studies of Rizal; that is, k is used in place of hard c, as "Ilokos", "Kagayan", s in place of z, a sound which does not occur in Filipino languages, "Kapis", "Samboanga", and s instead of c in such names as "Sebu". A still more important restoration is the use of b in place of v. The sound "v" does not occur in Philippine languages but owing to the confusion of b and v in Spanish orthography a most unfortunate error was made in writing such names as Bisayas, Bigan, and Bikol, "Visayas", "Vigan", and "Vicol". American authorities repeated the blunder. Some years ago a committee on geographical names was appointed in Manila, but unfortunately this committee was so little instructed in its task and so disposed to adhere to errors that had the sanction of a few years of use, that it failed to provide a proper system of orthography, or even to correct such inexcusable mistakes as the introduction of the letter v into the place-names of languages which do not contain this consonant at all. The "ow" sound in such names as Mindanao and Bolinao which is generally spelt now by Filipino writers "aw" is represented by Mr. LeRoy by the diphthong "au". In this he has the support of the nomenclature adopted in China and other parts of the East, and yet, if it is inadvisable to employ "aw" for the practical reason that it would never be pronounced by English readers in any way except to rhyme with "saw", it would seem best to retain the Spanish "ao", which has the advantage of long use and is capable of being correctly pronounced, in spite of the obstinate disposition of English-speaking peoples to invert this diphthong into "oa" as has happened in such words as "proa" and "cocoa". In a few cases Mr. LeRoy failed to carry out consistently the system of orthography which he obviously preferred. "Guagua", for instance, should have been written "Wawa", and "Igorrots" requires but a single r.

The book everywhere reveals painstaking revision for the press, but a few proof errors may be noted: "Tuguegagau" for Tugegarau (p. 9), Nerzagaray for Norzagaray (p. 125). Archbishop Pedro Payo's name is several times misspelt, "Paya". A useful bibliographical list and an index complete the second volume. There are a couple of maps which are not quite satisfactory. For the student unfamiliar with the ground, special detailed maps are indispensable in order to understand the several campaigns which are narrated. These are not supplied.

DAVID P. BARROWS.

MINOR NOTICES

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1912. (Washington, 1914, pp. 734.) The policy of the American Historical Association in freely permitting publication, elsewhere than in its annual reports, of papers which have been read at its public sessions, occasionally bears fruit in a volume which, in respect to the part of its contents devoted to historical articles, is of much less interest than was the meeting from which it sprang. The Boston-Cambridge meeting of 1912 was a very interesting one, but, apart from the formal record of proceedings, it is represented here by but six articles, some of which are below the usual average of interest, and by seven smaller pieces, read in one or other of the various conferences, and quite brief though of distinct value. Of the latter the most useful make suggestions respecting the study of commercial history in various lines, and of slavery, and of Pennsylvania history in the middle portion of the nineteenth century. The six major papers mentioned are that of Professor Henry L. Cannon on "Royal Finances of the Reign of Henry III.", rather in advocacy of American publication of English Pipe Rolls than contributory to the substance of history; that of Mr. Henry O. Taylor on the "Antecedents of the Quattrocento", a comprehensive and large-minded survey; that of Mr. Henry P. Biggar on "The New Columbus", dealing with the results of modern research and recent discoveries, especially with Mr. Vignaud's findings; that of Dr. Clarence W. Bowen on "The Charter of Connecticut"; that of Professor Frank M. Anderson on "The Enforcement of the Alien and Sedition Laws", a thorough and informing piece of research; and Professor Carl Becker's very clever paper on "The Reviewing of Historical Books". The proceedings of the conference on military history are given at full length from a stenographic report. Those of the ninth annual conference of historical societies are accompanied by two papers, one by Mr. Charles K. Bolton of the Boston Athenaeum on "Genealogy and History", and one by Mr. Worthington C. Ford on "The Massachusetts Historical Society". The report of the Public Archives Commission is accompanied by a report of the proceedings of the fourth annual conference of

archivists and by full reports on the archives of the states of Louisiana and Montana, by Professor William O. Scroggs and Mr. Paul C. Phillips respectively. Then follows a classified list of the publications of the American Historical Association from its beginning in 1884, a guide long needed. The latter half of the volume consists of the letters of William Vans Murray to John Quincy Adams, 1797–1803 (practically 1797–1801), edited by Mr. Ford and presented as the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Succeeding Adams as minister to the Netherlands in June, 1797, Murray, who was a facile and vivacious writer, immediately began a voluminous correspondence with his predecessor, who during these four years represented the United States at the Prussian court. Murray was an accomplished man, and a keen observer as well as an assiduous correspondent. His narrative of what went on in Holland and elsewhere in his part of Europe during those eventful years is extremely entertaining. His remarks are acute, and if they are not precisely weighty, it must be remembered that he was but thirty-five when his service at the Hague began. In the main the interest of the letters relates to European history; but the episode of the French mission of Pinckney, Murray, and Ellsworth is set forth with so much fullness that this will always be one of the chief sources for its history.

Cuestiones de Historia del Derecho y de Legislación Comparada. Por Rafael Altamira y Crevea, de la Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Politicas y Catedrático de Universidad. (Madrid, Sucesores de Hernando, 1914, pp. 402.) The widespread regret over Professor Altamira's practically enforced resignation from the post of Director de Primera Enseñanza in which he was doing such notable work for the cause of Spanish education, will be tempered by the reflection that he will now find more time for writing. The volume which lies before us supplements his *Cuestiones Preliminares de Historia del Derecho Español* (1903) and consists of a series of essays on legal and institutional topics, some of which have already appeared in local periodical publications, now reunited for the first time. These essays fall into three fairly well-defined parts. First comes an admirable survey of the growth and development of Spanish law from the earliest times to our own day, together with useful discussions of the present state of our knowledge of this topic. Next comes a group of special essays on legal and institutional subjects, in which the Spanish topics are often significantly compared and contrasted with parallel developments north of the Pyrenees. Much of this part rests on original investigation and research, and adds considerably to our knowledge of the matters treated. Lastly, we have a number of summaries and syllabuses of lecture courses and seminars conducted by Señor Altamira when he was professor at the University of Oviedo from 1897 to 1910, which throw a flood of light on his method of teaching a traditionally difficult topic, and on the relative importance which he assigns to the different phases of Spanish legal and constitutional development.

It will be readily seen that this compact, convenient volume is a priceless boon to all who are specially interested in the matters with which it deals; and students of Latin America will also find much that is useful and apposite within its covers. The study of Spanish legal institutions has only recently begun to be conducted on scientific lines. In the movement which has led to this most desirable result, Professor Altamira has borne no inconsiderable part; and his wide acquaintance with conditions in other European lands, in Latin America, and in the United States gives his work a cosmopolitanism and breadth of appeal which will be deeply appreciated by all who have toiled wearily through the dreary pages of the ponderous works of the Spanish legal historians of the old school. The general survey with which the book begins will doubtless prove the most valuable part for American students, particularly because of the admirable descriptive notes on the various authorities. Spain's temporary loss of an able, patriotic, and devoted administrator promises to become the permanent gain of the world of historical scholars.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

Architecture and the Allied Arts: Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Romanesque, and Gothic. By Alfred M. Brooks, Professor of Fine Arts, Indiana University. (Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1914, pp. 257.) The *raison d'être* of this handsome and heavy volume is not obvious. It is beautifully printed, with broad margins and admirable photographic illustrations, but it has little to say regarding either the theory or the interrelations of the arts it professes to discuss; indeed the arts allied to architecture receive but scant notice of any sort. Moreover, Oriental and Renaissance art, with all their marvellous wealth in the products of the allied arts, are not included. The book appears to be in reality the substance of an elementary course of lectures to college students on the history of ancient and medieval architecture, with occasional brief excursions into the field of the allied arts, chiefly sculpture. But, being neither wholly historical nor dominantly analytical, the arrangement of the text-matter is sometimes confusing; less so, however, than the arrangement of illustrations, which are scattered without regard either to the adjacent text or even to numerical order. Thus figure 105 is followed by 85; 106 comes many pages after 118, and so on; so that reference to the figures by number imposes much vexatious searching. Lack of technical training is suggested in some of the criticisms, and in such errors as that of allowing but two systems of construction as possible—the lintel and the arch—thus ignoring both the truss and cohesive construction, which have been of so fundamental importance in modern work. The part played by stained glass in the development of Gothic architecture is hardly alluded to. There can certainly be no excuse for the blunder of offering as the plan of the Parthenon the plan of the pseudo-dipteral temple at Selinus (fig. 9).

These errors and omissions might be overlooked if the text set forth familiar facts and principles with great originality either of thought or expression, or with striking breadth and masterly grasp of the subject, but in these the book is certainly deficient. The statements of fact are, however, generally correct, and the critical judgments do not stray from the beaten path of the standard reference books.

A. D. F. Hamlin.

Kindred and Clan in the Middle Ages and After: a Study in the Sociology of the Teutonic Races. By Bertha Surtees Phillpotts, M.A. (Cambridge, Universtiy Press, 1913, pp. xii, 302.) "The aim of this book is to discover how long the solidarity of the kindred survived as a social factor of importance in the various Teutonic countries." To determine this Miss Phillpotts has made a study of all the various forms of action in which the kindred unit seems to have found expression. She finds that the kinsmen helped to pay and participated in the wergild, assisted as oath-helpers, had a part in reconciling enemies, helped to support indigent members of the kindred, defended rights of inheritance, and otherwise watched over the interests of the kindred group. The study covers the laws and customs of England, the Scandinavian countries, including Iceland, northwestern Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, and northern France. The materials used are of great variety: though the author by no means neglects the laws, she believes that the narrative sources give more trustworthy evidence in the matter of living custom; and she has been able to find much information in court records, charters, and kindred documents. Miss Phillpotts reaches a number of interesting conclusions. She finds first of all that the kindred unit has not, during historic times, played the important part that was once assigned to it by students of Germanic institutions. The English and the Icelandic sources show almost no traces of kindred solidarity: the apparent importance of kinship in England in the latter part of the tenth and the earlier part of the eleventh century the author attributes to Danish influence. In Denmark and northern Germany, however, the region that Miss Phillpotts accepts as the ancient home of the Germanic peoples, the institution lived on into the modern period: in Holstein there are traces of kindred activity as late as the nineteenth century (p. 245). The author discusses the various reasons that have been advanced for the decline of the kindred and rejects them all. It is her belief that migration was the true cause, especially migration by sea. She is also inclined to stress the influence of Protestantism with its emphasis on the responsibility of the individual. Miss Phillpotts also presents some interesting conclusions on the nature of the kindred in prehistoric times and on the importance of the group of kinsmen as an anti-feudal influence. Her study throws much light, not only on the specific institution that she has traced, but also on other related subjects. As a rule the author is conservative in her generalizations, but at times

she seems able to dispose of difficult facts and puzzling evidence with surprising ease and facility. While recognizing the great value of Miss Phillpotts's work, the reviewer doubts that the final word has yet been spoken on all the phases of this intricate subject. However, on the central problem of the study, that of solidarity and survival, the author's conclusions appear to be in complete agreement with the evidence.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Early Wars of Wessex: being Studies from England's School of Arms in the West. By Albany F. Major. Edited by the late Charles W. Whistler, M.R.C.S. (Cambridge, University Press, 1913, pp. xvi, 238.) Some years ago Major P. T. Godsal tried to trace the lines of Saxon conquest in southern Britain "by considering the military necessities and strategy involved in such a campaign". His work, *The Storming of London,* was, however, not taken seriously by students who still believed that history should be written from documents. Recently Mr. A. F. Major has been at work on similar materials, but he has used them with greater caution and has depended more on documentary evidence. Mr. Major believes that "much of the early history of these islands remains writ large on the face of the country" and he attempts to decipher these records. He accepts the narrative of the conquest given in the *Chronicle,* and tries to confirm and eke this out by a study of topography, earthworks, camps, roads, and other evidences of military occupation and activity. The first book deals with the rise of Wessex, the gradual expansion from Hampshire westward, and the long struggle with the Welsh kingdom of Devon. Much stress is laid on this warfare: it was "the school of arms" in which the Saxons learned how to resist the Danes at a later time. The second book gives a general account of the Danish invasions, while the third is devoted to Alfred's campaigns of 876–878. Many of Mr. Major's suggestions are extremely plausible; but most of his conclusions are hypothetical or supported by evidence that can be variously read and interpreted. In the use of documentary evidence he is not always critical. He appears convinced that the Saxon Shore "on the east coast of England was already more or less colonized by Saxons when the Romans came" (p. 95). He accepts the view of recent Norse historians who believe that Scandinavians visited Britain even before the Anglo-Saxon invasions (p. 94) and that they settled the Shetland Isles about 600 (p. 97). He finds Scandinavian settlements in southwestern England a century before the date given in the *Chronicle* as of the earliest appearance of Northmen in Wessex (p. 113). Mr. Major's identification of Leofwine (p. 135) and his explanation of Pallig's defection (p. 132) are at best doubtful. He also accepts the story that Edmund Ironside was assassinated (p. 135), which is probably mythical.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Alfred in the Chroniclers. By Edward Conybeare, M.A. Second edition. (Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons, 1914, pp. xi, 272.) The first edition of Mr. Conybeare's work on Alfred appeared in 1899 and was doubtless inspired by the Alfred millennium. In its present form the volume shows some revision but no changes in the plan. The larger part is made up of extracts from the more important English chronicles, such as the writings of Asser, Ethelwerd, and Simeon of Durham, and from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; however, the author has also included notices from writers as late as the fourteenth century, where these appear to have information not found elsewhere. These later touches to the story may, he thinks, "well be founded on some floating traditions". Among the writings represented is the spurious Crowland Chronicle, which Mr. Conybeare believes is "certainly no mere invention", though not the work of Ingulf. In an "introductory sketch" of some length, the author traces the career of the hero-king. The new edition, he assures us, "has profited by the criticism of my reviewers", but it cannot have profited much. The "sketch" is written from the point of view of the generation of Freeman and Green. Mr. Conybeare still uses such old, misleading terms as "mark" and "heptarchy". He still dates the unification of England from the overlordship of Egbert. Of the Danes in England he seems to know only what can be gathered from the English sources; of recent Scandinavian research along this line he is evidently not informed. But strangest of all, he seems not to have heard of the *Rolls Series*: in his bibliographical notes he refers to Savile's *Scriptores,* Petrie's *Monumenta,* Twysden's *Decem Scriptores* and other early editions, but never to the *Rolls Series.*

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Germany. By A. W. Holland. [The Making of the Nations.] (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1914, pp. viii, 312.) "At the present day, especially when so much is heard about Germany and the Germans, it is surely necessary that the large reading public should be familiar with the outlines of German history", says the preface. An authentic portrait of Queen Louise as frontispiece and some thirty other good illustrations indicate further the reader whom the author has in mind. He would have been wise, therefore, if he had selected a few interesting threads for connected treatment and focused on a few of the great personalities. Instead, he chronicles multitudinous events; dates and names abound. Occasionally, when he seeks to make some explanation, as he says, "in plain English", he resorts to analogies which are not particularly illuminating, as when he compares the *Reichskammergericht* to the Hague Peace Conference, or when he says Charles VI. with his Pragmatic Sanction was like an Englishman who has various bits of land—freeholds, copyholds, leaseholds, etc.—and "wants to make them into a single estate with a single set of deeds". The mention in the last chapter of the recent marriage of William II.'s

daughter to the Guelph heir gives an appearance of up-to-dateness to the volume and of attention to modern Germany; but more pages are devoted to the period before Charlemagne than to the period since 1848. The map of Prussia's growth from 1648 to 1795 has exchanged its proper designation and place in the text with the map meant to illustrate the Peace of Westphalia. The text also is not free from inaccuracies.

S. B. F.

Henry II. By L. F. Salzmann, B.A., F.S.A. [Kings and Queens of England, edited by Robert S. Rait and William Page.] (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. 267.) The series in which this volume appears promises "a new appreciation both of the kings and of the institution of royalty". Fortunately Mr. Salzmann keeps clear of the institution of royalty, and his judgment on Henry II., while sane and sober, is not strikingly new. What he has given us is a succinct and straightforward narrative of the events of Henry's reign, with three concluding chapters on legal and constitutional matters, finance, and "the English nation under Henry II." The limits of the volume offer small space for fresh material, but the author has used the fundamental sources well and has drawn to excellent purpose upon that inexhaustible mine of information for the twelfth century, the Pipe Rolls. Irish and Welsh affairs receive due attention, but the Continental aspects of the Angevin empire get scant consideration and are treated as "foreign affairs", by a persistent anachronism which forgets that they were quite as domestic as English matters. In the brief account of social and economic conditions the author naturally shows himself at home, but the intellectual life of the reign is slighted. The style, while unpretentious, is not without point, as when Giraldus Cambrensis is called "the proto-journalist". The illustrations are from seals and contemporary illuminations. Less vivid than Mrs. Green's little volume on the same subject, Mr. Salzmann's is still not dull, and both in research and in point of view it reflects the advance of historical study in twenty-five years.

C. H. H.

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-First Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A. D. 1184–1185. [Publications of the Pipe Roll Society, vol. XXXIV.] (London, St. Catherine Press, 1913, pp. xlii, 299.) Although one Pipe Roll of this period is apt to be much like another so far as the general trend of information yielded is concerned, the present is exceptional because of the great amount of space occupied with the activities of the royal justices. Here may be seen more clearly than in any previous roll how Henry's new legal and judicial machinery actually worked. Some items relating to the jury may serve to illustrate the nature of this material. A borough contributes to the royal

revenue for its failure to send a jury when summoned (p. 38). One hundred is fined for denying before the justices what it had declared in the county court (p. 161), another for concealing a plea of the crown (p. 23), and a third for placing on its jury a man not of the hundred (p. 210). A hundred-man must pay apparently for his indiscretion in putting villeins on the jury (pp. 161, 221); a record which seems to indicate that the indictment jury was selected by the bailiff of the hundred. And these are but few of the miscellaneous bits of information to be had about one institution.

Mr. Round has edited the text with his accustomed care. He also contributes in the introduction a brief survey of the contents with illuminating comments on notable aspects. It is a pleasure to note that the *index rerum* is fuller than in previous volumes, though it would be possible to include a still larger number of subjects advantageously in subsequent indexes. W. E. Lunt.

Essai sur l'Armée Royale au Temps de Philippe Auguste. Par Édouard Audouin, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. (Paris, H. Champion, 1913, pp. 234.) This is a revised, re-arranged, and much enlarged edition of the articles published by M. Audouin in *Le Moyen Âge* during 1912 and 1913. The author has again demonstrated that Philip Augustus had a standing army which, in 1202, numbered about 2700 to 2800 men, of whom about 2000 were not of the knightly class. The king was able to maintain this permanent force by taking contributions from some of his communes, cities, and abbeys, in place of the military contingent which they owed for three months' service. With the money he hired approximately one-quarter as many men for the whole year.

There are seventy-five pages of *pièces*, including (1) the Prisia Servientium, which the author has dated more accurately; (2) the fourteenth-century translation of this document; (3) a list of the military contributions furnished by the communes, cities, and abbeys in 1202; (4) eight documents showing the pay of the soldiers in various garrisons; (5) three sets of receipts and expenditures of royal officials in connection with military matters; and (6) inventories of the military supplies in some of the king's fortresses. All of these documents are admirably annotated, some unusual terms are defined and explained, the views and errors of earlier writers are discussed; the whole forms a body of material of interest to every student of the period. There is a bibliography of nearly 100 titles, and a good index. M. Audouin's articles in *Le Moyen Âge* brought out a considerable number of new points of view, and much new material; in this new edition, the value of the study is enhanced.

Comptes de la Ville d'Ypres de 1267 à 1380. Publiés par G. des Marez, Archiviste de la Ville de Bruxelles, et E. de Sagher, Archiviste de

la Ville d'Ypres. Tome II. [Académie Royale de Belgique.] (Brussels, Kiessling et Cie., 1913, pp. viii, 1042.) The present volume contains the annual accounts of the revenues received and the disbursements made by the treasurers of Ypres from 1316 to 1329. Students of local, municipal, and economic history are likely to reap the richest harvest from its pages, but the gleanings which may be obtained on numerous other aspects of medieval civilization will well repay the efforts of the patient searcher. The organization and government of the municipality, the municipal works undertaken, the rights and duties of citizenship, the equipment and wages of soldiers, and the current prices of commodities are merely illustrative of the nature and variety of the subjects on which the entries in these accounts yield information. Of special interest are the sections given to the expenses incurred by municipal messengers and diplomatic agents, which furnish many details about the relations of Ypres to neighboring cities and countries. It is also noteworthy that a popular revolution resulting in the establishment of a new government in 1325 is reflected in the documents by a change of language from French to Flemish.

W. E. Lunt.

Bartolus of Sassoferrato: his Position in the History of Medieval Political Thought. By Cecil N. Sidney Woolf, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press, 1913, pp. xxiv, 414.) This book contains four chapters. The first deals with the life of Bartolus, the second with what the author calls the political theories of Bartolus, the third with the problem of the Empire, and the fourth with some general conclusions. The second is subdivided into sections dealing with the theories of Bartolus on the relation of the Empire to (a) the papacy; (b) the kingdoms within it; and (c) the city states or imperial cities. The third is a general survey of the theories of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries on the subject of the imperial and papal powers and the relation of Bartolus to such theories.

The author was set to work on this special task by Dr. Figgis and received the Thirlwall Prize for it. So far as concerns any contribution to the history of political theory the work must be considered as a fruitless task. The author has to acknowledge at the start that Bartolus was not a political thinker, but a lawyer, and to this acknowledgment he refers again and again in the pages of the book. The student of political theory must fail to see the *raison d'être* of the book.

For nearly one hundred pages the reader proceeds through long and sometimes pointless Latin quotations from the works of Bartolus, and yet all of the political ideas of the great jurist can be given on pages 99 and 100. By seizing upon *disjecta membra* in the works of Bartolus Mr. Woolf has got together some theories on the Empire and the papacy, but it is doubtful if Bartolus would recognize them as his own. The author has to acknowledge that Bartolus was a coward (pp. 86, 94) and

was afraid to say what he thought—that he reversed himself for fear of giving offense. A difference of opinion with Dr. Figgis is dragged in on pages 101–107 but it is difficult to see what it has to do with Bartolus.

On page 100 the author says that he hopes to show Bartolus occupying a high place in the history of political thought, but on page 211 he leaves us with this dilemma: "either that Bartolus was quite out of touch with the contemporary thought of his time, or that as a political thinker, he is negligible". Whichever way we choose we do not get a flattering view of Bartolus. After finishing the third chapter, which is almost entirely devoted to authors other than Bartolus, we are tempted to ask: "What political theories did Bartolus have at all to entitle him to the special treatment given in the title of the book?"

As a study showing that Mr. Woolf is capable of doing the highest kind of scholarly work this volume is ample proof, but we may reasonably doubt the wisdom of putting such works into print. Many special studies are undertaken by students in all parts of the world, of which, when they are finished, it must be acknowledged that they have been productive of no results, except to show that the student is capable of a high grade of work; but why put them into print?

James Sullivan.

Collectanea Franciscana. Edited by A. G. Little, M. R. James, and H. M. Bannister. [British Society of Franciscan Studies, vol. V.] (Aberdeen, University Press, 1914, pp. vii, 163.) This the fifth volume issued under the auspices of the British Society of Franciscan Studies is the fruit of a happy collaboration. It opens with a study (pp. 7–8) of "Brother William of England, Companion of St. Francis", by A. G. Little, M.A., in connection with which four early Franciscan drawings of great interest are reproduced from the Matthew Paris manuscripts. We are also indebted to Mr. Little for a detailed description (pp. 9–13) of a Franciscan manuscript formerly in the Phillipps Library which dates from about 1400 and which contains the Latin version of all the six chapters of the *Fioretti* that Sabatier was unable to find in any manuscript of the *Actus Beati Francisci* when he published his critical edition of the latter work in 1902. Mr. Little further prints (pp. 141–153), from the Cotton Charter in the British Museum, some lists of friars of the English Franciscan Province, who died early in the fourteenth century. These lists, which are preceded by a brief introduction, are the only original records of the English provincial chapters yet discovered. In addition to Mr. Little's contributions, the present volume includes an account (pp. 114–123) of "The Library of the Grey Friars of Hereford", by M. R. James, Litt.D., F.B.A., vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and a short notice by the Rev. H. M. Bannister, M.A. (pp. 124–140), of "Some Manuscripts of the Cambridge Friars now in the Vatican Library". Every student of Franciscan history must be grateful to Messrs. Little, James, and Bannister for their joint labor in the prep-

aration of this first installment of the *Collectanea Franciscana,* which is highly creditable both to themselves and to the society under whose auspices it is published. The very full index (pp. 156–163) contributes not a little to the practical utility of the work. And praise is due to its admirable production by the Aberdeen University Press.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346–1367. Edited with Introduction and Notes by James Tait, M.A., Professor of Ancient and Medieval History, University of Manchester. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XX.] (Manchester, University Press, 1914, pp. xi, 394.) The appearance of these two short fourteenth-century chronicles under the able editorship of Professor Tait is an event of some importance for English medieval historiography. A quite substantial preface, a valuable scholarly introduction of historical, biographical, and critical character, covering, with two appendixes, almost one hundred pages, and then 150 pages of full and careful notes, provide almost more than a sufficiency of comment for little over one hundred pages of text. The first and longest of the two texts has been known and used in manuscript for half a century and seems to have been the source of information and model for portions of other better known chronicles such as Higden's *Polychronicon,* Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana,* the continuation of Murimuth's *Chronicle,* and a large part of the English *Brut* having to do with the third quarter of the fourteenth century. It was probably compiled at Westminster by a somewhat humble and obscure monk named John of Reading. The other text is that of a short and comparatively unimportant chronicle of unknown authorship compiled at Canterbury. Both chronicles cover the history of the years between 1346 and 1367 and have much to say about the Hundred Years' War and the activities of the Black Prince in Spain.

The special student of English history will find much of real interest and profit in Professor Tait's introduction and notes. The former is a model of good and scholarly organization and the treatment of the value and importance of the Westminster chronicle is particularly valuable from historical, critical, and bibliographical viewpoints. Useful synopses, summaries, facsimiles, and foot-notes are furnished in connection with both chronicles. In certain instances, however, the work of editing and note-making appears to have been done hastily or carelessly. Twenty separate items fill a page of "Addenda et Corrigenda", while an examination of the text and notes reveals occasional errors and slips that have been overlooked in reading the proof. Such minor defects do not seriously detract from the value of the publication as a contribution to our knowledge of fourteenth-century history and historiography. John of Reading's *Chronicon,* in particular, throws valuable light on domestic and foreign affairs between 1359 and 1367, especially in

connection with London and Westminster, and with the Black Prince's undertakings in Spain and their influence upon England's relations with France and Scotland. The anonymous Canterbury chronicle has some value and importance as a brief independent treatment of the twenty years between 1348 and 1367.

The volume appears to have a very complete and satisfactory index, while in presswork and binding it maintains the high standard of the University of Manchester publications, which now are so numerous and well known.

N. M. Trenholme.

Pageant of the Birth, Life, and Death of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warkick, K. C., 1389–1439. Edited by Viscount Dillon, D.C.L., F.S.A., and W. H. St. John Hope, Litt.D., D.C.L. Photo-engraved from the original manuscript in the British Museum by Emery Walker, F.S.A. (London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1914, pp. x, 109.) The word "pageant" had a variety of meanings in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in England. It was used for the movable or wheeled platform of the show, for the show or pageant proper, and for the pictures or illustrations of some great event or notable career. It is, of course, in the third meaning that it is used here, for this handsome small quarto volume contains a well-edited series of late fifteenth-century drawings, with appropriate mottoes, illustrating in an interesting and graphic way the career of Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, 1389–1439. This nobleman was very famous in the fifteenth century as a courtier, a knight, and a soldier, though he is chiefly remembered now as the father-in-law of Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, the "King Maker", his successor, These plates show how he was born, baptized, knighted, and how he acquitted himself in life. There are fifty-three well-executed historical drawings but the name of the artist is unknown. He had considerable ability in depicting military and religious scenes and, if not a foreigner, had probably been trained abroad as he shows Renaissance characteristics.

The drawings were first reproduced, in a somewhat crude and imperfect manner, in Strutt's *Horda Angel-Cynnan* (1775). Another set of reproductions was prepared a century later for the Roxburghe Club with an introduction by Sir E. Maunde Thompson, but it was limited and expensive. The present work is, therefore, the first adequate and popular presentation of the drawings and mottoes. The editors have done their work well and modestly and the volume will prove of value as an illustration of fifteenth-century life, customs, armor, and costumes, besides furnishing an interesting biography of the central figure of the Warwick pageant.

N. M. T.

Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos Jours. Par le Vicomte de la Jonquière. Nouvelle édition entièrement refondue et complétée. In two volumes. [Histoire Universelle publiée par une Société de Professeurs et de Savants sous la Direction de M. V. Duruy.]

(Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1914, pp. 472; 732.) After a third of a century (the "deuxième édition" of 1897 was a reprint) this book has been revised and continued by its author. The part revised hardly deserves the appellation "une œuvre nouvelle". While countless minor stylistic changes have been made, often to little advantage, there has been no thorough reworking of the material. Additions have been made, as in regard to legends of early Turkish times (I. 38 ff.), the influence of the Byzantine Empire upon the Turkish (I. 60, 71, 101), the story of early Montenegro (II. 3 ff.), and the nineteenth-century insurrections in Crete (II. 30 ff.). But a number of inadequacies and errors remain, many of which might have been corrected by using the German works of Zinkeisen and Jorga. In particular, the political organization of the great days might have been better developed to correspond with the full treatment, after D'Ohsson, of the judicial organization (I. 118–127, 196–201). The author reveals some change of views in the directions of less sympathy with Mohammedanism, severer strictures upon Greek Orthodox "schismatics", and more devotion to Roman Catholicism. But in both religious and political matters he is remarkably impartial. The French public possesses, in the older portion of the book alone, a more adequate history of Turkey than exists in English.

The added portions, nearly equal to the original work, give a certain disproportion to the book. Eighty-nine pages carry the story from 1878 to 1908, 274 pages deal with the events of the past six years, and 264 pages, of which two-thirds is new, survey present conditions, geographical, racial, and religious, political, military, and economic. The disproportion is not regrettable. Whereas the first edition was mostly third-hand, the new material, from observation and verification during the author's thirty years' residence in Constantinople, is practically first-hand. The narrative, which is mainly political, is careful and accurate, and interspersed with valuable discussions and opinions. The account of the military operations of 1913–1914 is disappointingly brief and bald. The only serious mistake observed is in the assertion that the British government has spent much money to support Protestant missionary work among the Armenians (II. 492), and the neglect to mention the work of the American missionary colleges, whereas the parallel work of the French missionary schools is given place (pp. 567, 568). The last chapter discusses in sound and reserved fashion the future of Turkey. While accepting the constitutional régime as permanent, the author feels less hope than formerly that Turkey, bound by its *Sheri* or Sacred Law and its administrative tradition, can give equal treatment to Christian or even to non-Turkish Moslem citizens.

The bibliography has been nearly doubled (now 14 pp.), mainly by the addition of books on the period since 1878. The titles are nearly all French, with a few in Latin, Italian, and English; German is represented by a few French translations. There is no index, and the geographical list of the first edition is omitted. Of the six maps in black and white,

three are new, showing present political and ethnographical conditions in the Balkan Peninsula, and the existing and projected railways of Asiatic Turkey.

ALBERT HOWE LYBYER.

Commentaires de Blaise de Monluc, Maréchal de France. Édition critique publiée et annotée par Paul Courteault, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Bordeaux. Tome II., 1553–1563. [Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire.] (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1914, pp. 587.) The present volume of M. Courteault's definitive edition of the *Commentaires* of Blaise de Monluc maintains in all respects the extremely high standard set by its predecessor (which, by the way, was erroneously entitled "volume II." in the notice which appeared on p. 654 of vol. XVII. of this journal), and by the editor's earlier biography of Monluc and critical estimate of his historical work (*cf.* AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIV. 119, 848).

The events here described are of course chiefly military, and occurred, part of them during the last phase of the Hapsburg-Valois conflict, and the rest during the opening years of the French Civil Wars. By all odds the most interesting and brilliant of them and the one which added most to Monluc's reputation was his defense of Siena against the Imperialists under the Marquis of Marignano from July, 1554, to April, 1555. His selection for this difficult task was due to the fact that Piero Strozzi, who commanded the Siennese forces, desired to wage war in the open country and needed an ally to hold the city. Apparently the king had a good many doubts about giving the job to Monluc, for fear that his Gascon temper and rough manners would embroil him with the Siennese: and a couple of precious pages of self-revelation, and of aggrieved vindication of the qualities of impatience and irascibility in general, found their way into the *Commentaires* as a result of the royal hesitations. Despite severe illness, and constant difficulties with the undisciplined Siennese, Monluc acquitted himself with great credit, and if Strozzi had been able to avoid defeat outside, might well have maintained his position, and forced the Imperialists to raise the siege. As it was, he successfully repulsed a number of assaults, and finally forced his adversary to resort to tactics of starvation. The account of the miseries suffered by the besieged during the last months before the capitulation is highly realistic; and Monluc's self-laudation is so naïve, consistent, and undisguised that it is totally unnecessary to warn the reader to make allowances for it. "Le nom de Monluc ne se trouvera jamais en capitulation", so he boldly assured the Imperialist envoys on the morning of the very day when terms of surrender were actually agreed upon, and the garrison permitted to march out with all the honors of war.

One more volume ought to carry this admirable work to its close in 1575. A full and detailed index will be indispensable to absolute com-

pleteness, and if M. Courteault will but follow the admirable example which he has set himself in *Blaise de Monluc, Historien,* we shall have one.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

The Puritans in Power: a Study in the History of the English Church from 1640 to 1660. By G. B. Tatham, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press, 1913, pp. vi, 282.) One of the curious though perhaps natural results of the appearance of a comprehensive history of any given period is that, so far from discouraging research, it seems to stimulate the production of monographs on some phase or detail of the events described in the more general account. There can be no doubt that Professor Gardiner's influence, quite apart from the attacks of his critics, has influenced many others to reinvestigate many of the problems which he undertook to solve. From the appearance of Mr. Inderwick's admirable study of the Interregnum to the present work the path of the student of the Puritan Revolution is strewn with similar essays. It would not seem at first sight that Stoughton's history of the Church under the Commonwealth would have left much room even for so detailed a study of something of the same subject as the book now put forth by Mr. Tatham under the rather general title which he has adopted. His work is, indeed, an account of the Puritans in power, but with the large limitation of being confined virtually to their religious, or rather their ecclesiastical, activities, and, within this category still, such as were related chiefly, not so much to their experiments in church government as to their treatment of the Establishment. The parochial clergy, sequestration committee activities, church property, the ejected clergy, the treatment of the universities, and the question of so-called "religious freedom"—virtually the persistence of Anglican services—these form the chapters. Of religious thought, of dissenters generally, as of constructive Puritanism, there is little to be found in these pages. Virtually it is the "immediate and material" results here chronicled, rather than the wide survey which the title seems to promise.

To illustrate these the author has brought together a very considerable amount of rather minute evidence drawn from a variety of sources, published and unpublished—though chiefly the former—from which he has drawn conclusions on the whole neither remarkably new nor striking. In one particular, however, they are valuable, for, generally speaking, they strengthen the position and contentions of Professor Gardiner, and they amplify the basis of our judgment. Some of them are of much interest. On the whole Mr. Tatham makes a good case for the Puritans in the universities; agrees, virtually, with Evelyn that the Church of England was "reduced to a chamber and a conventicle"; and provides an interesting discussion of that vexed question of the number of ejections, concluding that it is practically insoluble. Not the least interest-

ing part of his study is a determination of the old controversy between Macaulay and his critics regarding the status of the English clergy in the seventeenth century, in which he inclines to side with the great historian. In such matters, rather than in the broader and deeper questions inevitably raised in reading such a book, his work seems particularly valuable.

W. C. Abbott.

The Old Scots Navy, from 1689 to 1710. Edited by James Grant, LL.B. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. XLIV.] (London, printed for the Navy Records Society, 1914, pp. lix, 448.) Under the auspices of the Navy Records Society, Mr. Grant has brought out a volume which helps to elucidate a hitherto very obscure period of Scottish naval history. The book is primarily a collection of papers relating to the Scottish navy between the years of 1689 and 1707, and Mr. Grant has succeeded in the difficult task of giving coherence to what would otherwise be a confused mass of materials, by grouping the documents in chapters, each of which presents a complete episode or complete phase of the subject. The part played by the Scots frigates the *Pelican* and the *Janet* in the stirring events of 1689, the siege of the Bass Rock, the Darien expedition, the absorption of the Scots navy at the Union, and the history of the office of Lord High Admiral form the central subjects of the more important chapters and receive fresh elucidation from the sources which Mr. Grant has brought together.

The brief summaries which head the separate collections make the documents considerably more accessible to the ordinary reader, but the latter will naturally find his interest centre in the "general introduction", in which Mr. Grant has given a short but scholarly outline of the history of the Scottish navy prior to 1689.

The main influences, internal and external, which fostered naval development in Scotland are sufficiently indicated. Scotland, a country of scattered islands and indented coasts, whose mountainous western shores were barely accessible by land, could never have been consolidated without naval force. The early reigns of the Alexanders and the later reigns of James IV. and James V. supply illustrative detail of the fact that sea-power was the one method by which the turbulent and semi-independent chiefs of the West could be brought into submission to the crown.

From without came a driving force no less compelling. Scotland with its long coast-line was particularly exposed to attack from the fleets of her enemies. In early times the strength of the Northmen at sea, and in later the increasing development of the English navy, compelled Scotland in self-defense to look to her naval resources, and we have the phase of enthusiasm which reached its highest point in the eager activities of James IV.

The union of the crowns, as Mr. Grant has pointed out, was at once

a check and a stimulus to the Scottish navy. The chief foe on the Scottish horizon had vanished, but the exigencies of English foreign policy exposed the scanty fleets of Scots merchantmen to new dangers on the high seas, and a navy was more than ever necessary for their protection. In actual fact, however, the Scots navy was already declining into insignificance prior to its ultimate absorption with the stronger force. The introduction closes with a sketch of the history of the Admiral's office, and the development of his powers, especially upon the jurisdictionary side.

Although the book is one which is somewhat technical in subject and also, perhaps necessarily, in treatment, it will have considerable interest for all students of naval annals, and, to those who are anxious to pursue the subject further, the excellent table of reference to the documentary sources should prove of great value.

A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763–1912. By Stanley C. Johnson, M.A. [Studies in Economics and Political Science, edited by W. Pember Reeves, no. 34.] (London, George Routledge and Sons; New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1914, pp. xvi, 387.) This painstaking and scholarly doctor's dissertation is an account of the flow of population from the British Isles to the United States and Canada for the last 150 years. It is dense with facts, buttressed with statistics and clinched with citations from a great number of documents. All sides of the subject are gone into and, besides a review of the Causes of Emigration which touches on the chief currents in the industrial history of the United Kingdom since 1763, we have chapters on Assisted Emigration, the Transport of Emigrants, Restrictions on Immigration, the Reception of Immigrants, the Destination of Immigrants, Land Systems affecting Immigrants, Colonization Schemes, the Emigration of Women, the Emigration of Children, and the Economic and Social Value of Emigration and Immigration. The chapter on Transport paints a dark picture of fraud and exploitation. The struggle to subject the oversea carriage of emigrants to government regulation and inspection bore a singularly close resemblance to our contemporary struggle for industrial legislation. The history of the emigration of women and children is a cheering record of the diffusion of the spirit of humanity and the steady growth of a sense of collective responsibility. The author's industry has rescued from oblivion precious social experiences we ought not to forget.

Dr. Johnson presents with much force the present conflict of interest between England and her colonies respecting migration. England, sparse in country and congested in city, wants outlet for her superfluous, town-bred population. The colonies want the country-bred British who can take up homesteads, and set up such stringent requirements for admission that the town-bred migrants from the homeland can hardly pass muster. He feels that these requirements select the wheat and leave the human chaff to remain with the mother-country.

In his comments on the situation in the United States the author sometimes stumbles. He does not know that since 1906 this country has had a uniform rule of naturalization. He offers the proportion of prisoners and paupers among immigrants and natives as an index to comparative criminality and pauperism, without taking into consideration the difference in the age composition of the two groups. In reviewing the social effects of immigration he overlooks the spirit of the emigrant, the effect upon the rate of increase of the native population, and the broad contrast in social psychology between the resulting heterogeneous people and an old people.

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS.

Paris pendant la Terreur. Rapports des Agents Secrets du Ministre de l'Intérieur, publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par Pierre Caron. Tome II., 6 Nivôse an II.—*27* Nivôse an II. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1914, pp. 404.) These reports, as stated in a notice of the first volume (AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XVII. 184–185), belong to a series begun in August, 1793, and continued until April, 1794. Apparently the series for Nivôse is relatively complete, for the present volume covers less than a month, while its predecessor covered four months. A few reports, or parts of reports, by the "observers" Grivel and Siret were published seven years ago by M. Caron in one of the *Bulletins de la Commission de l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution,* and are not reprinted in this volume. Although the observers, who made almost daily reports, numbered fourteen or fifteen, the body of public opinion from which they quote or upon which they comment seems restricted to what may be described as *sans-culotte.* Other types of opinion would, indeed, be unlikely to be much in evidence in January, 1794. The observers, however, are on the lookout for counter-revolutionaries, conspirators, and persons without obvious reasons for being in Paris. They keep a close watch upon theatres and often complain of the *incivique* character of the plays. For example, one of them reports a play called *Les Contre-Révolutionnaires,* in which the counter-revolutionaries brought on the stage are "des êtres chimériques, et qui n'existent plus depuis longtemps; ils sont d'ailleurs si maladroits qu'ils excitent encore plus de pitié que de ressentiment, plus de mépris que d'horreur. Le personnage qui, pour les surprendre, se déguise en ambassadeur espagnol, est un mauvais plaisant, qui joue ce rôle plus en bouffon qu'en patriote." He adds that the piece is full of malevolent thrusts, which were enthusiastically applauded, and says Paris should have only three theatres, the Opéra, the Théâtre-Français, and the Théâtre-Italien. The tone of the reports is on the whole moderate, although one of the observers quotes with apparent approval a savage reference to the Dauphin and Madame Royale as *les deux louveteaux.* But another mentions the horror excited by the news of the *noyades* at Nantes which were described as "patriotic baptisms".

As the reports were to be stopped in April on account of their alleged Dantonist sentiments, it is interesting to note the attitude of the observers in the controversy which raged throughout Nivôse over the publication of the early numbers of the *Vieux Cordelier* by Danton's friend Camille Desmoulins. The observers seem to limit themselves to descriptions of the effect produced upon the minds of the people. They occasionally explain that the people deplore the bitterness of the controversy between Desmoulins and Hébert and declare that the Committee of Public Safety should intervene. No markedly Dantonist opinions are revealed, not even apropos of the arrest of Fabre d'Eglantine.

Among the illuminating facts recorded in these reports are the high prices and the danger of the complete failure of certain supplies, like meat. Current opinion, of course, attributed the evil to the machinations of the butchers or the wholesalers. There is interesting evidence also of the widespread desire to reopen the churches in spite of the anti-religious policy of the government.

H. E. Bourne.

Figures du Passé: Danton. Par Louis Madelin. (Paris, Hachette, 1914, pp. 324.) The Danton whom M. Madelin portrays is not a pale political abstraction. His tumultuous joy in combat, his devotion to his friends, his delight in a *foyer confortable,* his love of the soil, especially of his acres at his native Arcis, make him intensely alive. Moreover, M. Madelin studies him as a biographer, not as a hostile critic nor as a eulogist. This is what readers of his *Fouché* had reason to expect. In a few instances, however, his interpretations of Danton's conduct are not fully satisfying. This is true of the period from March, 1792, to August 10. In March Danton's name was mentioned for the "patriot" ministry. His check on this occasion, the author believes, threw him into violent antagonism to the court. But Danton's outbursts were so furious that one is forced to conclude that the controversies over the war with Austria and suspicions of the royal policy furnish part of the reasons. A similar question might be raised apropos of Danton's rôle in the old Cordelier district in 1789, although in this case one must confess that it is hard to discover any motive more lofty than demagogic jealousy or the irresistible impulse to assert himself.

The question of Danton's venality seems to haunt and puzzle the author all the way through. He remarks: "Rien qui paraisse plus contraire aux qualités et même aux défauts de Danton que cette misérable chose, dont certains de nos lecteurs estimeront peut-être que la preuve est faite. Il n'a pas les traits d'un vulgaire fripon." Nevertheless, M. Madelin appears to think that M. Mathiez has made out a case against Danton. His view, accordingly—to pass over the question of money accepted from the court—is that when Danton had the disposition of large funds, "La main ne se refermait pas: il y tombait de l'or, il en coulait presque autant. Parfois il lui en restait. . . . Quand il lui en

restait, il se payait probablement de la facile excuse qu'il s'était donné bien du mal, sans gagner beaucoup, à faire avancer la Révolution et comme il aimait la terre, il achetait la terre, l'imprudent!"

The account of the *Vieux Cordelier* incidents and of Robespierre's relation to this journal is open to criticism. In the first place the famous exclamation beginning "Open the prisons" belongs to No. 4, with which Robespierre apparently had nothing to do. Moreover, it is commonly believed that Robespierre looked over the proofs of No. 2 because he wanted to employ the witty journalist's pen in continuing the attack on the Hébertists which he had himself begun at the Jacobin Club. Not until Desmoulins wrote No. 3, containing his analogies from Tacitus, did Robespierre think he was going too far.

H. E. Bourne.

The Passing of the Great Reform Bill. By J. R. M. Butler, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London, New York, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1914, pp. xiii, 454.). This monograph was prepared originally in 1912 as a dissertation for a fellowship in Trinity College, Cambridge. Mr. Butler would appear to have selected his subject during the excitement evoked by the Parliament Act of 1911. At least, without being misled by a false parallel between the two constitutional changes, he has strengthened his narrative of the events of 1830–1832, by viewing them with an interest derived from the contest of three years ago. He chooses for emphasis what he terms aptly the "driving force" of reform—the organized disorder which impelled the Whigs to adopt the bill, at the same time providing them with an irresistible pressure to carry it through. The biographies and memoirs upon which the study is based are all generally familiar; they have been used in conjunction with such material as the Place manuscripts and the Home Office Papers to frame an account of the Reform Bill much more definitive than the inadequate one by Molesworth. The narrative is very well done; but even better than the narrative itself is the skill shown in tracing the influence of public agitation upon the passing of the bill. Where a less discriminating writer would make this influence causal, Mr. Butler quite rightly sees it only in the light of an accompanying phenomenon.

The monograph would be more acceptable had it contained nothing but the narrative connected with the passing of the bill. Unfortunately, Mr. Butler, exceeding the immediate subject of his research, commences with chapters on reform before 1830. The chapters are superfluous as a preface; moreover, their language creates an initial prejudice against the book. Few readers will feel confidence in an historical essay which begins by describing the rule of George III., without qualification, as a *tyranny*. Even in a young disciple of the Macaulay-Trevelyan school, this remains an amazing indiscretion; but it is surpassed by a reference later to George IV. as the *hated* king. A further chapter (VI.), entitled

Opinions and Ideas, or what Mr. Butler elsewhere speaks of as the "psychological issues" of the reform struggle, also stands apart from the narrative. Like the opening chapters, it bears traces of being put together hastily, without sufficient bibliographical foundation, and with no very thorough comprehension of the questions involved. The same immaturity marks the opinions pronounced here and there upon the political conduct of Grey and of Wellington—patronizing criticisms, ill becoming the abundant inexperience of a collegian. The English political historians, now held up as models by certain sections of the English university history schools, did enjoy the prerogative of sitting in judgment; a due sense of proportion should keep them in this one respect above the common reach of academic imitation.

These imperfections of detail are indeed regrettable, because they mar an otherwise excellent book. Mr. Butler's work is not only valuable as a history of the First Reform Bill; in the opinion of the reviewer, it would form a most useful introduction to the study of the early Victorian era.

C. E. Fryer.

Cavour, and the Making of Modern Italy, 1810–1861. By Pietro Orsi, of the University of Padua, Deputy in the Italian Parliament. [Heroes of the Nations Series.] (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914, pp. xix, 385.) This is a summary of the history of the Risorgimento from the fall of Napoleon I., in 1815, to the fall of Napoleon III. and the completion of Italian unity, in 1870. Some dozen years ago Count Orsi published an earlier volume in which he described the conditions of Italy during the last half of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth. Now, by making Cavour the central figure in the drama, he is able to give coherence to his account of the actual creation of Italy as a nation.

Count Orsi possesses unusual skill in condensation, and joined with this skill is a well-developed sense of perspective. A third quality which he possesses in no small measure is fairness. When we add that he has adequate knowledge of his subject, it will readily be seen why he has produced so good a compendium. He is, in a word, a safe chronicler. The novice in Risorgimento history may well begin with this book; and students of wider information may turn to it for a succinct statement of the important episodes.

In his effort to be fair Count Orsi seldom passes judgments that would wound the prejudices of the survivors or descendants of the partizans of the Risorgimento. Exception is made, of course, of the Austrians and Bourbons, and in part of the Papalists, whose iniquities and corruption are more than hinted at. But the great clash of personalities and the irreconcilable ideals and methods of Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi—not to mention a score of secondary but important leaders—are dealt with very gently. In a popular summary, written with the

avowed purpose of making Italians to-day feel that their fathers who created Italy were all brothers, this method has obvious advantages. In any detailed history, however, it would not do; for the interaction of personal antipathies is as important a fact among political heads as is the conflict of tactics among soldiers.

On the other hand, Count Orsi manages to outline a good many portraits, and by a liberal quotation from speeches or letters he adds to the authoritativeness of his sketch. "Safe", "informed", and "urbane" are the epithets that fit it. The translation is generally well done. On page 260, however (l. 4 from bottom) "preventive" should be previous, and "intimation" (p. 262, last line) should be notice.

The Beginnings of Colonial Maine, 1602–1658. By Henry S. Burrage, D.D., State Historian. (The State, 1914, pp. xv, 412.) The period of "beginnings" to which Dr. Burrage confines himself extends to 1658, when Massachusetts acquired jurisdiction over the last of the Maine settlements. To the sources for the period, diligently collected in recent years by Mr. J. P. Baxter and others, the author has been able to make only comparatively unimportant additions, the most notable being the Cleeve petition of 1643, which he prints for the first time (pp. 328, 329). He has, however, pursued his investigations independently both in this country and in England, and in a number of points has corrected the mistakes or supplied the omissions of earlier writers. Such traditional opinions, for example, as that Monhegan Island was the site on which Waymouth erected a cross in 1607 (pp. 69–71), or that Pemaquid was the site of a settlement prior to the arrival of the Popham colony (p. 84), or that a part of the Popham company remained in America and removed to Pemaquid or Monhegan (p. 118), ought to be effectually dissipated by Dr. Burrage's clear presentation of the facts. A needful correction is also made of Parkman, and of the English translator of Father Biard's narrative in Thwaites's *Jesuit Relations*, as to the location of the Jesuit colony on Mount Desert.

For the rest, Dr. Burrage has given us a scholarly and readable summary of the beginnings of settlement in Maine. The numerous and sometimes conflicting grants which gradually covered the region are painstakingly examined and their complicated history traced. Chapters VII., and XV., on the French settlements at Mount Desert and Castine respectively, are especially informing. Not much of novelty could be expected in an account of Sir Ferdinando Gorges or Trelawney after Mr. Baxter's exhaustive treatment of both subjects, but Dr. Burrage's narrative is clear and well proportioned, and takes account of such new material as has appeared since Mr. Baxter wrote. Another useful chapter traces the career of Robert Jordan in relation to John Winter and the Trelawney claimants. Upwards of twenty-five illustrations add to the value of the book.

Save for the activities of the Gorges family and the acquisition of

the region by Massachusetts, the history of Maine has undoubtedly been somewhat neglected by the writers of comprehensive histories. Dr. Burrage finds the explanation of the slow growth and comparative unimportance of the Maine settlements in the fact that the great political and religious controversies which characterize the history of England in the early seventeenth century found the people of Maine on the wrong side. There were Puritans in Maine, but the greater part of the proprietors and settlers were Episcopalians, and trade rather than religion furnished the chief colonizing motive. In the controversies with the crown, accordingly, Maine was predominantly royalist. The explanation is interesting but hardly sufficient. Virginia was largely Episcopalian and royalist during the same period, yet Virginia was a prosperous colony by the time of the Civil Wars. Is it not true that soil, climate, proximity to the French, and the aggressive predominance of Massachusetts were contributing causes quite as important as episcopacy and royalism?

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

Maps of Providence, R. I., 1650, 1765, 1770. By Henry R. Chace. (Providence, the compiler, 1914, pp. viii, and 6 plates.)

Owners and Occupants of the Lots, Houses, and Shops in the Town of Providence, Rhode Island, in 1798, located on Maps of the Highways of that Date; also Owners or Occupants of Houses in the Compact Part of Providence in 1759, showing the Location and in whose Names they are to be found on the Map of 1798. Compiled by Henry R. Chace. (Providence, the compiler, 1914, pp. 28, and 18 plates.) These two thin quarto atlases of neatly executed maps are the fruit of much antiquarian enthusiasm and of much minute research in the old deeds, wills, and other records of the town of Providence, and among the manuscripts preserved by the Rhode Island Historical Society. In the first atlas, the map of 1650 shows the location of the thirty-nine householders indicated by the tax list of that date. The second map shows the highways of the town in 1765. The remaining four, taken together, show the owners or occupants of houses, and their holdings, in what the Fire Act of 1759 defined as "The Compact Part of the Town of Providence". Careful indexes of names follow the maps. The second atlas is constructed mainly by the use of the original returns compiled by the commissioners for the direct tax of 1798. These schedules, preserved in the library of the Rhode Island Historical Society, show the situation, dimensions, and materials of all houses, and the names of their owners and occupants. From these materials, and the town records, Mr. Chace has with great patience constructed a real-estate map of the town as it was in 1798, presented in eighteen sectional plates, and accompanied by an elaborate and ingenious index which conveys much information as to holdings, owners, and occupants. Mr. Chace explains in a modest preface that "the amateur who did this work for his own diversion did not at the

time anticipate public examination of the maps". But the service he has performed for local history is a very substantial one, and his example is well worthy of imitation in all our older cities.

Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts. Volume III., 1662–1667. [Edited by George Francis Dow.] (Salem, Essex Institute, 1913, pp. 534.) Mr. Dow's third volume is constructed on the same plan as its predecessors (*supra,* XVIII. 631), the records of the court being printed *seriatim* and in full on the upper parts of the pages, while below are extracts of all that is most significant in the files, illustrative of the cases or of the social life of Essex in the years covered. For other than local and genealogical readers (for the latter the volume is of course full of information), it is this last-mentioned aspect in which it will have its greatest value. A remarkable index, including both names and subjects, facilitates such use of the book, by its multitude of classified entries under such topics as animals, books, clothing, crimes, food, furnishings, and utensils. It is natural to turn first to items under witchcraft. There is very little of the matter, less than one would expect of any given county in any five years of the seventeenth century. Court records, records for the most part of evil-doing and contention, can never show the whole nor the best of the life of a community; but, within its own field, we may say that if ever a volume lifted the roofs from multitudes of seventeenth-century houses and showed us fully what was going on within, this volume does so. Its workmanship shows every evidence of admirable care. The reviewer cannot think it is well to refrain from expanding the various symbols of abbreviation for per-, pre-, and pro-; many a reader will not know that "piury" means perjury, and "puidence" providence.

Records of the Columbia Historical Society. Volume XVII. *Washington Letters.* (Washington, the Society, 1914, pp. 258.) The publishing committee of the Columbia Historical Society has conceived the excellent project of printing in a separate volume all those extant letters of President Washington which relate to the laying-out and organization of the Federal District and the erection thereon of the Federal City, as he was always careful to call it. The present volume is the fruit of this undertaking. The letters, very few of which have been printed before, are derived from the letter-books of Washington in the Library of Congress, from a collection in the office of the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, and from a few other sources. They illustrate in a very interesting manner the history of the beginnings of the city of Washington, but would do this more completely if they were better supplied with annotations, for lack of which persons unfamiliar with the real history of Washington (that is, nearly all readers) will fail to obtain from the book the full significance of its story. But as an illustration of the character of President Washington the collection is of

capital excellence. Here is a portion of his career as president in which he had a free hand, unhampered by Congress or by the actions of foreign governments. It shows in full detail the qualities of Washington the administrator—his sobriety of judgment, his severe sense of legality, his care in details, his union of personal firmness with consideration for others, and in general the secure touch of the man who for twenty years had been almost incessantly occupied with public duties. In aesthetic matters he puts forward his opinion with great modesty and deference, bnt is usually right. After he ceases to be president the letters relate mostly to the mansion which, with characteristic care for details, he is erecting for his own residence. Several letters of much interest are concerned with the project of a national university, and one or two relate to the projected transfer of the faculty of the University of Geneva, which has been known hitherto in connection with the name of Jefferson, but which it seems was also suggested by John Adams.

The Diary of William Bentley, D.D., Pastor of the East Church, Salem, Massachusetts. Volume IV., 1811–1819. (Salem, Essex Institute, 1914, pp. 737.) This fourth volume of Dr. Bentley's diary is the last of a series undeniably interesting; just how valuable or important is a question that requires definitions. The value of a diary written in an American town of twelve thousand inhabitants, even in a period including the War of 1812, depends on the town and the quality of the observer. The town was Salem, in which the diarist was a minister of the established Congregational church from 1783 to 1819. Few American towns of that time were more important or more interesting, and, while much of this voluminous record is a chronicle of small beer, after all the book is published for purposes of local history, and meets them with great wealth of detail. Dr. Bentley was a man of learning and a clergyman, but this volume has relatively little to say of books or of theology, and there are almost no introspective passages. The reverend doctor was a downright, practical, active-minded man, intensely and broadly interested in what went on around him, and gives therefore a minute and varied account of all sorts of events, a rather wonderful photograph of the life of his burgh in all its aspects—building, business, fishing, privateering, soldiering, politics, elections, church doings, music, visits of distinguished persons, gossip, little excursions, storms, seasons, births, marriages, and deaths. The latter give rise to numberless brief biographies of Salem folk, mostly plain Americans, whose character and careers are outlined with insight and clearness. But strong prejudices appear in these vignettes and elsewhere. The doctor was an unenthusiastic parson of the old school, practically a Unitarian, and viewed the new sects and the more "evangelical" and orthodox lights of his own church with contemptuous dislike. In politics, however, his sympathies were in general with the Democrats, though some Democratic men and measures were far from receiving his favor. We are not to look for the most discerning statements concerning public characters from one who can say of

Joseph Story in 1815, "His brainless ambition and deficient principles promise nothing good to his influence"; but as a picture of a community the book has few rivals. This fourth volume contains a minute subject-index to the whole series.

Der Deutschamerikanische Farmer: sein Anteil an der Eroberung und Kolonisation der Bundesdomäne der Ver. Staaten besonders in den Nord Centralstaaten. Von Joseph Och. (Columbus, Ohio, *Ohio Waisenfreund,* 1913, pp. ix, 248.) The one strong impression which this work gives, is that of the enormous quantitative influence of the German farmer in the United States during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The book is mainly a discussion of the statistical matter bearing on the subject, found in the reports of the Twelfth Census of the United States; those of the Census of 1910 were not yet available when the author did his work. He shows that in 1900 persons of German parentage owned and cultivated 522,252 farms, or 10.6 per cent. of all farm homes in the United States, and almost as much as the combined holdings of the next three largest farm-holding foreign elements, the English (and Welsh) with 183,157, the Irish with 176,968, the Scandinavian with 174,694, together 534,819 farm homes. (Twelfth Census, vol. II., *Population,* part II., p. 742.) During each decade between 1870 and 1900 the German immigration increased its holdings to the extent of 120,000 farm homes. The rate of increase exceeds that of the other most successful national elements named. The German farmer has settled most thickly and is most prosperous in the North Central district, which represents the backbone of agricultural wealth in the United States. Among other interesting subjects which the author treats is that of the migrations of the native population, who in their new location enter into industrial pursuits somewhat more frequently than the foreign population, leaving to the latter a proportionately larger share of the farming. The author's arrangement of his material is in many cases not happy, and he would have gained in clearness by the exclusion of matter irrelevant.

The book attempts also a quantitative estimate of the farmer of German blood, whose ancestry goes back to the early nineteenth or to the eighteenth century in America. It does not, however, as the title might imply, give a qualitative estimate of the German farmer's work at any period. Such questions as extensive and intensive farming, products raised, changing of crops, improvements made, are hardly touched upon in this work. The influence, *e. g.,* of the small farm upon the agricultural success and stability of the nation is an interesting subject for investigation. In this respect the Pennsylvania German farmer of the eighteenth, and the Wisconsin farmer of the nineteenth, century furnished an object lesson. These small farmers did their work well with their own hands, assisted by their families; they bought more land when they had the money to pay for it; they did not take large farms with heavy mortgages, which might turn them out of house and home in a bad season.

The book of Dr. Och is mainly statistical, though valuable in its very limited field.

A. B. Faust.

An Artilleryman's Diary. By Jenkin Lloyd Jones. [Wisconsin History Commission, Original Papers, no. 8.] (Wisconsin History Commission, 1914, pp. xviii, 395.) Dr. Jones served as a private in the 6th Wisconsin battery from August, 1862, until July, 1865. But few days in this period are without an entry in the diary and as a result we have a complete story of the life of a private soldier. Incidents of the camp and march, comments upon the country and the people, the latest word by grape-vine, grumblings and gossip, are all duly noted. The dullness of months spent at the same station is often reflected with an accuracy that will discourage the general reader; but the student who persists to the end will be amply rewarded.

Throughout the diary there are constant references to the demoralization caused by drunkenness. It must have been difficult to maintain discipline when officers "staggered into camp beastly drunk" and brawled about "while the boys flocked around to see 'the example set'". There seems to have been much "foraging" and "jay-hawking", but Dr. Jones is right when he declares that "the bulk of the Union Army so largely composed of boys was of stern stuff with their lives rooted in seriousness and committed to sobriety".

The diary give the writer's experiences with the battery in the expedition down the Mississippi and the Yazoo in the spring of 1863, in the operations before and during the siege of Vicksburg and when it formed part of Sherman's army in the forced march to Chattanooga and in the fighting at Missionary Ridge. Then followed over a year and a half of service in station at Huntsville, Alabama, Etowah Bridge, Georgia (near Allatoona), Nashville, and Chattanooga. At the battle of Nashville, the battery was held in reserve. The evidence the diary offers as to the weather conditions immediately before the battle is of special interest.

We think the publications of the commission deserve better printing.

The Quakers of Iowa. By Louis Thomas Jones. (Iowa City, Iowa, the State Historical Society of Iowa, 1914, pp. 360.) The State Historical Society of Iowa has made possible this volume on *The Quakers of Iowa,* written by Dr. Louis T. Jones while a research assistant for the society. The author is a Friend, well known to many of that denomination, having lived in four different states where Friends are numerous, and has had access therefore to an abundance of material which an outsider might not have been able to obtain.

The book is in five parts, including Historical Narrative, Iowa Quaker Orthodoxy, Minority Bodies of Friends, Benevolent and Educational Enterprizes, and Religious and Social Life. The first part deals briefly with the rise and spread of Quakerism in England and America

and traces the history of Quakerism in Iowa from its origin in 1835 to the present. The second part gives a history of the change which has taken place in the application of the orthodox ideas of the members as they pertain to essentials in belief and practice. The third part gives a brief history of the various smaller bodies of Friends in the state with an account of the causes leading to the separations which have taken place. The fourth part outlines the work of Iowa Friends in educational and missionary activities together with chapters on their labors in behalf of the negroes and American Indians. The fifth part gives a summary of the religious beliefs of Iowa Friends together with an account of their home life and distinctive manners and customs.

The 441 notes and references grouped together at the end of the work add very distinctly to the value of this contribution. The book is also provided with a full and carefully prepared index. It is written in good style and is both interesting and highly instructive. It contains much material of general interest about Friends and is a valuable contribution to Quaker literature.

HARLOW LINDLEY.

Retrospection: Political and Personal. By Hubert Howe Bancroft. (New York, The Bancroft Company, 1912, pp. x, 562.)

The New Pacific. By Hubert Howe Bancroft. Revised edition. (New York, The Bancroft Company, 1912, pp. x, 549.) As a work of historical or of contemporaneously critical value no very high rank can be given to this *Retrospection* from Mr. Bancroft's pen. But as a human document, as impressionistic testimony, the book has a value of its own, coming as it does from a man who reached San Francisco in 1852—from an eye-witness of events in California through six decades. And it is not only his own experiences that Mr. Bancroft had to do with. We all learn how he interested himself at an early stage of Californian history in searching out what pertained to the beginnings and growth of human occupation in all that great stretch of country over which Spain had spread, little by little, her imported civilization, mingled with what was there before her entrance into the continent. He was curious about the past when it had hardly slipped from the present, and that timely curiosity saved what would have been lost had it not been for him. His words cannot be neglected. But it must be confessed that they do not compose into a masterpiece of literature. Into the rather rambling phrases that fill over five hundred pages, are packed desultory recollections and fortuitous comment on men and events. The sketch of his own life and purposes is subordinated to this collateral subject-matter. The inconsistencies of law, the failure of justice to be ethical or even practical, the graft and grafters that California has known, the advantage of popular rule rather than representative government, laudation of referendum and recall, are among the topics that receive his vigorous lashings or approval. As he does not scruple to mention names freely both

in praise and blame, some passages are racy reading. For instance, he cannot say enough about his admiration for Theodore Roosevelt and Hiram Johnson, while he does not veil his feelings in regard to the founder of one Californian university—feelings which are the reverse of sympathetic. Thus, as first-hand conclusions about past California in the passing, the volume may be of aid to a later historian.

The New Pacific is no longer so very new, even in this new edition, and the reality and romance of the great South Sea that it touches on are more or less familiar, now that the world has grown used to anticipating the passage through the canal into that island-dotted sea with its potential future. In spite of the romance it suggests, the book is less readable than the *Retrospection,* redeemed from its verbosity by its unmistakable personal touch. Here there is too much matter. The gist could be put into much smaller compass to advantage. Undoubtedly it will be. For many speeches will have to be made in 1915 and here is a useful mine of suggestion for pertinent matter.

Biografía de J. Félix Ribas. Por Juan Vicente González. [Biblioteca de Grandes Autores Americanos.] (Paris, Garnier Hermanos, 1913, pp. lxxxix, 262.) The biography of José Félix Ribas is a volume in a series which contains certain productions of prominent authors and publicists of Spanish America. This volume is a reprint of a book which is not found in many libraries of North America. A preface furnishes meagre information in regard to the author, Juan Vicente González, who lived and died in the city of Carácas. This preface is followed by a discussion of "La Proclama de Guerra á Muerte" by the editor of the reprint, R. Blanco-Fombona. The editor discusses the inherited, psychological, and environmental influences, which, in his opinion, explain or justify the proclamation of the war to the death against the Spaniards which Bolívar made at Trujillo on June 15, 1813.

The introduction is followed by González's biography of Ribas, 1775–1815, a relative of Simón de Bolívar who figured in the revolt of Venezuela against Spain. This biography, which is based in part upon rare contemporary material, for example, the *Gaceta de Carácas,* describes in some detail that dramatic period of Venezuelan history which extended from 1809 to 1815. After mentioning the rôle of Ribas as a member of the provisional government which was established at Carácas in 1810, a narrative is given of his career as a military commander until he was put to death by the royalists. The attitude of Simón de Bolívar and of Antonio Nicolás Briceño towards the war to the death is discussed, and suggestions are made of the evil influence which that war exerted upon the life and manners of the Venezuelans. This biography contains some errors and some misleading statements; it was written about fifty years ago and was based partly upon tradition. It contains some interesting but overdrawn portraits of Venezuelan leaders: Miranda, who "bore the torch of the revolution from France", Boves, "the ferocious pirate",

Arismendi, "the bloody ogre, the Bluebeard of America". The style of González is vivid: the book contains some graphic descriptions of events: the first constituent congress of Venezuela is described as being composed of leaders "who desired to reach the promised land without crossing the Red Sea". This reprint will be useful to some students of South American history not only because it contains some rare original material which concerns the history of Venezuela, but also because it makes available a biography which conveys the atmosphere of the revolutionary era.

W. S. Robertson.

Discursos y Proclamas. Por Simón Bolívar. Compilados, anotados, prologados, y publicados por R. Blanco-Fombona. [Biblioteca de Grandes Autores Americanos.] (Paris, Garnier Hermanos, 1913, pp. xlvii, 302.) This volume contains a large number of the speeches and proclamations of Simón de Bolívar, liberator of Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia. Almost fifty pages are taken up by an introduction which was written by the editor, R. Blanco-Fombona, a Venezuelan scholar who has displayed a special interest in the liberator's career. The introduction contains a sympathetic but exalted estimate of the liberator as a literary artist: the editor declares that the writings of Bolívar constitute the best expression of his age in the Castilian tongue: "in literature he was also the liberator".

There is only one note appended to the discourses and proclamations which deals with the provenance of the documents which Blanco-Fombona reprints; that note is concerned only with Bolívar's last proclamation, of December 10, 1830. With this exception the reader is not explicitly referred to the collections from which the documents are taken. The absence of critical notes is to be regretted; for the texts of the discourses and proclamations which are printed by Blanco-Fombona do not always conform exactly to the texts which are found in the monumental collections of Boliviana that were edited by J. F. Blanco and S. B. O'Leary. Unless indeed the process of rectification which certain Venezuelan scholars have applied to the letters of Bolívar has recently been applied to his discourses and proclamations, errors have been made in reading the proof. Some of the documents which are contained in this volume are preceded by explanatory notes. The discourses and proclamations which are reprinted by Blanco-Fombona are dated from 1811 to 1830; the work of selecting the documents for publication was well done. Among the discourses are: the speech of Bolívar to the patriotic society of Carácas, July 3, 1811; his speeches to the congress of Angostura in 1819; and his discourse to the congress of the republic of Bolivia which was sent to Chuquisaca along with his project of a constitution for Bolivia. The proclamations in this volume were issued from 1813 to 1830: they are mostly stirring addresses which the liberator directed to the soldiers of his army and to civilians: Venezuelans, Colombians,

Spaniards, and Peruvians. This volume is accordingly a convenient collection of original material which deals with the political ideas and the military campaigns of the remarkable warrior-statesman who exercised so profound an influence upon the fortunes of northern South America during the heroic age.

W. S. Robertson.

NOTES AND NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the American Historical Association will be held in Chicago, December 29–31. The headquarters of the Association will be at the Auditorium Hotel and all sessions will probably be held there with the exception of that devoted to the address of the president, Professor McLaughlin, which will be read at the Art Institute. The programme, while not yet completed, is sufficiently definite to warrant the announcements which follow. In ancient history, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Roman history will be represented by Professors Rogers of Drew Theological Seminary, Breasted of Chicago, and Westermann of Wisconsin; and Mr. Wallace E. Caldwell of Columbia University will have a paper dealing with "The Greek Attitude towards War and Peace". In medieval history Professor Haskins of Harvard will deal with "The Greek Renaissance of the Twelfth Century"; Professor Lunt of Cornell with "The Lyons Tenth, 1274–1280"; Dr. Harvey of Chicago with "Economic Self-Interest in the German Anticlericalism of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries". Professor E. W. Dow of Michigan will also have a paper. In the history of medieval England there will be papers by Miss Bertha H. Putnam of Mt. Holyoke College, upon "Maximum Wage Laws for Priests after the Black Death"; by Professor James F. Baldwin of Vassar College; by Professor J. F. Willard of Colorado College, on "The Revolution in the Exchequer under Edward I."; and by Professor N. M. Trenholme of the University of Missouri, on "Municipal Aspects of the Rising of 1381". In the session on modern England there will be papers by Professors C. W. Colby and G. M. Wrong; by Professor Edward R. Turner of Michigan on "The Privy Council of 1679"; and by Professor Shipman of Princeton on John Wilkes.

The year 1914–1915 being the one-hundredth anniversary of the fall of Napoleon, it has seemed appropriate to emphasize Napoleonic history. To this end there will be a conference upon its study, at which Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University will read a paper dealing with the opportunities and the needs of such research in the United States. This paper will be followed by a discussion. In addition there will be a special session devoted to the Napoleonic era, in which papers will be read by Professor Ford of the University of Minnesota on "Boyen's Military Law"—foundation of the Prussian service; by Professor R. M. Johnston of Harvard entitled "An Approach to a Study of Napoleon's Generalship"; by Professor Victor Coffin of Wisconsin and

by Professor Henry E. Bourne of Western Reserve University on "The Men who helped to make the Napoleonic Régime".

Another special feature of the programme is to be a session devoted to the relations of Europe and the Orient. In this Professor Theodore F. Jones of New York will deal with some topic connected with the relations of Venice to the East; Professor Frederick Duncalf of the University of Texas promises a paper on some phase of the social structure of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem; Professor Albert H. Lybyer of the University of Illinois will read upon "Changes in the Trade Routes of Europe between 1291 and 1571"; Dr. Robert H. Lord of Harvard upon some topic connected with the relations of Russia in Asia.

"The Significance of Sectionalism in American History" will be the subject of Professor Frederick J. Turner of Harvard. Other papers in American history will be by Mr. Henry B. Learned of Washington on "Cabinet Meetings under Jackson"; Mr. Alfred H. Stone of Mississippi on "The Factorage System of the Southern States", and by Professors Farrand of Yale and Sioussat of Vanderbilt University.

It is planned to have the session on Wednesday evening, December 30, representative of the whole field of history. Provision has also been made for meetings of the archivists, of the historical societies, and of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. The formal programme, to be distributed later, will contain detailed information as to hotel facilities, railroad rates, and the like.

The *Annual Report* for 1912 has been distributed to members, and is noticed elsewhere (p. 184). Of that for 1913, composition upon which could not be begun till the opening of the present fiscal year, the first volume is at the Government Printing Office. The second will consist of the papers of James A. Bayard the elder, Federalist representative in Congress and senator and one of the five commissioners in the negotiations at Ghent. The papers, which have been edited for the Historical Manuscripts Commission by Miss Elizabeth P. Donnan of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, are of great interest, covering all parts of Bayard's public career, but with especial fullness his diplomatic mission, for which there is an entertaining diary in addition to the letters. Most of the materials come from the collection possessed by Mr. Richard H. Bayard of Baltimore.

Miss Violet Barbour's Adams Prize essay, *Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington,* is in the press and nearly ready for publication.

In the series of *Original Narratives of Early American History,* Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons will issue this autumn *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675–1691,* edited by Professor Charles M. Andrews, and embracing narratives of Bacon's Rebellion and of the outbreaks in North Carolina, Maryland, Massachusetts, and New York (Leisler).

In the absence of Professor Merriman, Professor Arthur L. Cross of the University of Michigan has been made treasurer of the Committee

on a Bibliography of Modern English History. Subscriptions, of which more are of course desired, may be sent to him at Ann Arbor.

PERSONAL

Professor Ralph Charles Henry Catterall of Cornell University died suddenly on August 2, at the age of forty-eight. He had taught eight years in the University of Chicago, and twelve at Ithaca, where he was professor of modern European history. His book on *The Second Bank of the United States* is recognized as of exceptional ability; but his unusual learning in modern history and his extraordinary powers of thought would have been still more clearly revealed by the works which his recent illness and untimely death prevented him, to the regret of many warm and admiring friends, from bringing to a conclusion.

Abner C. Goodell, of Salem, Massachusetts, died there on July 20, at the age of eighty-four. A notable lawyer, a collector of books, a scholar of remarkably extensive and accurate learning in Massachusetts history, Mr. Goodell was occupied from 1865 to 1890 as editor of the *Acts and Resolves of the Province of Massachusetts Bay.*

Robert A. Brock, for many years corresponding Secretary of the Virginia Historical Society and of the Southern Historical Society, died in Richmond, July 12, aged seventy-five years. He edited eleven volumes of the *Collections* of the former society, and many volumes published by the latter, and was of great service in keeping the cause of history alive in Virginia in evil and difficult times.

Professor P. Orman Ray of Pennsylvania State College has been elected professor of history in Trinity College (Hartford, Connecticut).

Professor Franklin L. Riley has been called from the University of Mississippi to be professor of history in Washington and Lee University. Dr. James E. Winston of Princeton University has been appointed professor of history in his stead, in the University of Mississippi.

Dr. Bernadotte E. Schmitt of Western Reserve University has been made assistant professor of history in that institution.

Dr. Solon J. Buck has been appointed assistant professor of history in the University of Minnesota; Dr. Wallace Notestein has been promoted to an associate professorship in the same institution; Dr. Theodore C. Pease, who has lately completed his report on the local archives of Illinois, takes Dr. Buck's place as research assistant in the Illinois Historical Survey.

GENERAL

The Nineteenth International Congress of Americanists, which was to meet at Washington in this present month of October, has been postponed till some time when the international character of the gathering can be insured.

All members of the American Historical Association are invited to attend the meeting of the New England History Teachers' Association on the evening of October 23 in Boston. The topic will be recent English history. The list of speakers will include Messrs. Edward Porritt and George L. Fox.

A French translation of Dr. Eduard Fueter's *Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie* has been published by the house of Félix Alcan, Paris (pp. vii, 785), under the title *Histoire de l'Historiographie Moderne.* The translator is Émile Jeanmaire, and the author has added somewhat to the text and contributed more notes. As the make-up of the book is superior to that of the German edition, the translation will probably find its way to shelves where the original stands already. It is unnecessary to repeat that this book should, in any case, be on the five-foot shelf of every student of modern history.

Henri Berr, the editor of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique,* has arranged for the publication of a *Bibliothèque de Synthèse Historique,* to have as its general title *L'Évolution de l'Humanité,* and to embrace one hundred volumes. The list of the fifty-one volumes assigned to ancient and medieval history and of their authors will be found at pages 338–342 of the April issue of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique.* The remaining volumes will be divided about equally between the modern and the contemporary periods. The price has been fixed at four francs a volume, by the publishers, Mignot and Tallandier of Paris.

There has been formed in connection with the Göttingen Academy a commission on the history of religions which has undertaken the preparation and publication of a collection, in the German language, of *Quellen der Religionsgeschichte* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht). The editorial work has been intrusted to Professors Andreas, Otto, and Titius. The volumes of the earlier undertaking, *Religions-Urkunden der Völker,* have been incorporated in the new series as the first three volumes. Where desirable, critical editions of the original texts will be published in a separate series.

Professor Georges Renard of the College of France is the editor of a co-operative *Histoire Universelle du Travail* (Paris, Alcan) in twelve volumes. There have already appeared B. Nogaro and W. Oualid, *L'Évolution du Commerce depuis Cent Cinquante Ans*; G. Renard and A. Dulac, *L'Évolution Industrielle et Agricole depuis Cent Cinquante Ans*; P. Louis, *Le Travail dans le Monde Romain,* and Capitan and Lorin, *Le Travail en Amérique avant et après Colomb.*

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library continues its list of works relating to Scotland, and begins in the July and August numbers an important and minutely prepared list of newspapers and official gazettes possessed by the library, arranged in alphabetical order of places, extending, in the two issues named, to New London.

The second volume of the *Continental Legal History* series, edited by Sir John Macdonald and Edward Manson, entitled *Great Jurists of the World,* contains biographies of twenty-six great jurists. The sketches, many of which were originally published in the *Journal of Comparative Legislation,* are divided into four periods: "(1) that in which Roman Law was developed; (2) that in which it was regarded as the common law of Continental countries; (3) the period of the supremacy of natural law in many of its forms; (4) the age of codes and legislation".

The British Academy has lately published, in volume VI. of its *Proceedings,* and separately, two more of the papers read before the International Congress of Historical Studies in April, 1913, that of Professor Silvanus P. Thompson on *The Rose of the Winds: the Origin and Development of the Compass-Card,* and that of Professor C. H. Firth on *The Study of Modern History in Great Britain.*

Major-General Edward A. Altham, one of the most expert students of military history in the British army, brought out just before the outbreak of the present war the first volume of *The Principles of War, Historically Illustrated* (Macmillan) in which the uses of infantry, cavalry, and artillery, machine guns and engineers, communications and orders, and other means of warfare are studied with great freshness of view and with abundant illustration from history, especially from the history of our Civil War, and of the South African and Russo-Japanese wars.

From Messrs. Scribner comes volume VI. of the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* which extends from "Fiction" to "Hyksos".

Part VI. of the new edition of *The Golden Bough,* by J. G. Frazer, *The Scapegoat,* studies the various ways in which primitive man transferred the evils from which he suffered to inanimate objects, animals, or human beings.

Mrs. Anna Robeson Burr, who five years ago published a notable book on the autobiography as a literary *genre,* has given in her *Religious Confessions and Confessants* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin) a penetrating and brilliant study of an element in human nature and experience which has had its importance in, and of which she draws examples from, every period of human history.

A body of papers of the late Mr. Henry C. Lea, relative to the subject of witchcraft, and partly prepared by him for publication, has been placed in the hands of Professor George L. Burr, who hopes before long to present them in the form of a book, under some such title as *A History of Witchcraft, edited from the Published and Unpublished Materials of Henry C. Lea.*

Ancient Rome and Modern America: a Comparative Study of Morals and Manners, by Guglielmo Ferrero, gives little attention to ancient Rome, but comments on dominant traits of modern civilization.

The two volumes of the collected *Historisch-Politische Aufsätze und Reden* of Professor H. Oncken (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1914, pp. vii, 344; 381) relate mainly to Germany during the last century, but include the address on America and the Great Powers. Other volumes of historical essays recently published are G. Schmoller's *Charakterbilder* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1913); G. Morin's *Études, Textes, Découvertes, Contributions à la Littérature et à l'Histoire des Douze Premiers Siècles* (Abbey of Maredsous, 1913, pp. xii, 526); Professor A. Chuquet's *Historiens et Marchands d'Histoire, Notes Critiques sur de récents Ouvrages* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914) and *Études d'Histoire* (seventh series, *ibid.*); Dr. Cabanès's *Fous Couronnés* (Paris, Michel, 1914), which includes essays on Philip II., Peter the Great, Christian VII., and Lewis II. of Bavaria; and Professor H. Cordier's *Mélanges d'Histoire et de Géographie Orientales* (Paris, Maisonneuve, 1914). Among the recently published presentation volumes of essays are *Mélanges Holleaux* (Paris, Picard, 1914), relating to Greek antiquities; *Mélanges Thévenin* (Paris, Champion, 1914), relating to French institutions; *Études d'Histoire Juridique offertes à Paul Frédéric Girard* (Paris, Geuthner, 1913, 2 vols., pp. xxi, 442; 549); *Mélanges offerts à M. Henri Lemonnier* (Paris, Champion, 1913, pp. xvi, 563), on the history of art; and *Miscellanea di Studi Storici in Onore di Antonio Manno* (Turin, 1913, 2 vols.), on Italian history.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. D. Xenopol, *Natur und Geschichte* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 1); W. Goetz, *Historischer Unterricht und Historische Forschungsinstitute* (Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, IV. 4); J. W. Thompson, *The Mendacity of History* (North American Review, June); S. R. Steinmetz, *Die Bedeutung des Krieges bei den Kulturvölkern* (Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft, May, June); A. B. Show, *Die Kulturgeschichtschreibung Karl Lamprechts* (Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, IV. 2; see also correspondence, *ibid.*, IV. 3, ff. 197–199, IV. 4, p. 270, and Seeliger in Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 2, pp. 288–290); E. Hennig, *Der Geschichtsunterricht in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, IV. 4).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General reviews: Seymour de Ricci, *Bulletin Papyrologique, 1905–1912* (Revue des Études Grecques, April); P. Ducati, *Die Neuere Etruskische Forschung* (Die Geisteswissenschaften, May 7).

The Prussian Academy has undertaken the task of photographing and accurately describing all representations of foreigners on ancient Egyptian works of art. In *Sitzungsberichte*, 1913, XXXVIII. 769–801, Professor Eduard Meyer gives a report of an expedition for the purpose, led by Dr. Max Burchardt.

Professor A. T. Clay has completed part II. of *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, for which he has selected fifty-

six tablets of a legal nature dealing with Babylonian history from 312 to 65 B. C.

Professor Robert W. Rogers of Drew Theological Seminary has occupied himself, during a year's leave of absence spent at Oxford, in rewriting his *History of Babylonia and Assyria* for a new edition.

René Dussaud has thoroughly revised and greatly enlarged his *Les Civilisations Préhelléniques dans le Bassin de la Mer Égée* in a second edition (Paris, Geuthner, 1914, pp. x, 482). More than three hundred illustrations enrich the work. The chapter on Aegean influence in Egypt and Syria is new. J. J. Courcelle-Seneuil has published *Héraclès, Les Égéens sur les Côtes Occidentales de l'Europe vers le XVI^e^ Siècle avant notre Ère* (Paris, Leroux, 1914).

A very useful handbook, with numerous references to authorities, is Dr. Peter Thomsen's *Kompendium der Palästinischen Alterthumskunde* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1913, pp. 109).

The sixth volume of Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft* will be a comprehensive *Handbuch der Archäologie,* by Heinrich Bulle and other scholars, in fifteen parts, of which the first (Munich, Beck, pp. 184) has already appeared.

Athens and its Monuments, by Professor C. H. Weller (Macmillan), is a clear and concise account of the remains of the ancient city, frequently based on the work of the American School at Athens.

The third volume of Eugène Cavaignac's *Histoire de l'Antiquité* deals with Macedon, Carthage, and Rome from 330 to 107 B. C. (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914). For the same period, R. Schubert has prepared *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914).

An *Histoire des Machabées ou Princes de la Dynastie Asmonéenne* has been written by F. de Saulcy (Paris, Leroux, 1914). A recent German publication on *Rom und die Hasmonäer* is by O. Roth (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914).

A study of *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army,* by G. L. Cheesman, is announced for speedy publication by the Oxford University Press.

Miss Susan H. Ballou of the University of Chicago issues in a pamphlet of eighty-nine pages (Leipzig, Teubner) a minute and thoroughgoing discussion of *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta,* with several plates and facsimiles.

In *Cäsaren-Porträts* (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1914, pp. 39), Dr. Ernst Müller, a physician, makes a study of the coin and sculpture portraits of the imperial personages of the first three centuries to trace family resemblances where possible.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Naville, *L'Origine Africaine de la Civilisation Égyptienne* (Revue Archéologique, July, 1913); H.

Winckler, *Vorderasien im zweiten Jahrtausend* [B. C.] *auf Grund Archivalischer Studien* (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, XVIII. 4); F. von Luschan, *Beiträge zur Anthropologie von Kreta* (Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, XLV. 3); P. Gardner, *Coinage of the Athenian Empire* (Journal of Hellenic Studies, XXXIII. 2); E. Kornemann, *Zur Altitalischen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Klio, XIV. 2); W. Soltau, *Der Ursprung der Diktatur* (Hermes, XLIX. 3); H. Gummerus, *Die Römische Industrie: Wirtschaftsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Klio, XIV. 2); P. A. Seymour, *The Policy of Livius Drusus the Younger* (English Historical Review, July); F. Weege, *Das Goldene Haus des Nero* (Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, XXVIII. 2).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Among the recent discussions of the origins of Christianity are C. Guignebert's *Le Problème de Jésus* (Paris, Flammarion, 1914, pp. viii, 192, reviewed by A. Loisy, *Revue Critique,* May 16); and Professor C. Clemen's *Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf das älteste Christentum* (Giessen, Töpelmann, 1913, pp. 88, reviewed by A. Loisy, *Revue Critique,* May 23), a supplement to his larger book on the same subject.

Monsignor Pierre Batiffol has published *La Paix Constantinienne et le Catholicisme* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914, pp. viii, 542) in continuation of his *L'Église Naissante et le Catholicisme,* which is now in the sixth edition. The relations between Christianity and the Roman Empire are also the subject of Fracassini's *L'Impero e il Cristianesimo da Nerone a Costantino* (Perugia, Bartelli and Verando, 1914) and of C. Boucaud's *La Première Ébauche d'un Droit Chrétien dans le Droit Romain, Contribution aux Fêtes Constantiniennes* (Paris, Tralin, 1914).

The *Revue des Deux Mondes* published during 1913 a life of St. Augustine by M. Louis Bertrand, which has been translated by Vincent O'Sullivan and is now published by D. Appleton and Company. The work is a sympathetic history of the man, not a doctrinal study.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Corssen, *Die Zeugnisse des Tacitus und Pseudo-Josephus über Christus* (Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, XV. 2); A. Jäggli, *Von Konstantin zu Augustinus, Gedanken zur Entstehung der Mittelalterlichen Gottesstaatsidee,* I. (Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift, XXXI. 1).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Reference Studies in Mediaeval History by Professor James W. Thompson of Chicago (pp. xviii, 233) is a revised and enlarged edition of his syllabus printed in 1907. It is a syllabus of subjects, rather than of individual lectures, and could be profitably used by many other teach-

ers than its author. The topics are well selected. The best trait of the book is the modernness of its very abundant references. Misspellings of names are not infrequent.

The *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum,* in the *Monumenta,* is nearly finished. The sixth volume, *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Aevi Merovingici,* ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison (Hannover, 1913, pp. 676), is important especially for the lives of St. Lambert of Liège and St. Wilfrid of York. The seventh will complete the series. During the year ending in April, 1914, also appeared part 3 of the fifth volume and part 1 of the sixth volume of *Constitutiones,* edited by Schwalm; the fifth volume of *Necrologia,* edited by Fuchs; and part 1 of the fifteenth volume of *Auctores Antiquissimi,* containing the *Opera* of Aldhelm, edited by Ehwald. Several other volumes are reported as nearly ready for publication. The commission plans to publish a notable group of volumes relating to fourteenth-century Germany, especially to Lewis the Bavarian and Charles IV.

Several studies of the economic conditions and relations of the monasteries during the Middle Ages have recently appeared. In continuation of Hansay's volume on the earlier history of Saint-Trond published in 1899, G. Simenon has done an admirable piece of work on *L'Organisation Économique de l'Abbaye de Saint-Trond depuis la Fin du XIII^e^ Siècle jusqu'au Commencement du XVII^e^ Siècle* (Brussels, Hayez, 1913, pp. 632, reviewed by J. Closon, *Le Musée Belge,* May). M. Garaud has written *L'Abbaye Sainte-Croix de Talmond en Bas-Poitou, circa 1049–1250, d'après le Cartulaire: Étude d'Histoire Économique et sur le Droit du Poitou au Moyen Âge* (Poitiers, Bouarez, 1914, pp. xvi, 219). A German monastery is studied in Söhn's *Geschichte des Wirtschaftlichen Lebens der Abtei Eberbach im Rheingau, vornehmlich im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, Bergmann, 1914). Other recent volumes on medieval monasteries are J. Heldwein, *Die Klöster Bayerns am Ausgange des Mittelalters* (Munich, Lindauer, 1913, pp. xv, 202); Klohn, *Die Entwicklung der Corveyer Schutz- und Vogteiverhältnisse* (Hildesheim, Lax, 1914); W. Hoppe, *Kloster Zinna* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914) in the *Veröffentlichungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg*; Brasse, *Geschichte der Stadt und Abtei Gladbach* (vol. I., Gladbach, Kerle, 1914). R. Charles and Menjot d'Elbenne have edited the *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Vincent du Mans, 572–1188* (Le Mans, Saint-Denis, 1914); and W. Ziesemer, *Das Marienburger Konventsbuch, 1399–1412* (Danzig, Kafemann, 1913).

Recent publications of documents relating to the history of universities include the long delayed second volume of the *Cartulaire de l'Université de Montpellier* (Montpellier, Mauriol, 1912, pp. clviii, 930), edited by J. Calmette; the first part of the second volume (1401–1440) of the *Codice Diplomatico della Università di Pavia* (Pavia, 1913); and the second volume of the *Chartularium Studii Bononiensis* (Bologna, 1914).

A second edition of Mr. Henry O. Taylor's *The Medieval Mind,* which adds a chapter on towns and gilds, and one on the influence of the Crusades, and makes some minor changes, has recently been issued by the Macmillan Company.

The formation of the kingdom of Burgundy is the subject of Dr. Adolf Hofmeister's *Deutschland und Burgund im früheren Mittelalter* (Leipzig, Dyk, 1914).

Dr. Louis J. Paetow opens the historical series of the *Memoirs of the University of California* by presenting *The Battle of the Seven Arts,* a French poem by the trouvère Henri d'Andeli. An introduction of some thirty pages discusses the general subject of the age-long conflict between classical and modern studies, the rise and decline of interest in the ancient classics in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the present poem and its author. The writing is ascribed to the second quarter of the thirteenth century. Then follows, with full annotation, the text, scientifically established, a translation, and facsimiles of the two extant manuscripts of the poem.

G. Schlumberger is the author of an excellent account of the *Fin de la Domination Franque en Syrie après les Dernières Croisades, Prise de Saint-Jean-d'Acre en l'An 1291 par l'Armée du Soudan d'Égypte* (Paris, Plon, 1914). J. Delaville Le Roulx, who has already edited the *Cartulaire Général des Hospitaliers, 1100–1310,* and written a history of *Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre, 1100–1310,* has carried his studies further in *Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes jusqu' à la Mort de Philibert de Nailhac, 1310–1421* (Paris, Leroux, 1914).

The history of the Inquisition has received useful contributions in H. Theloe's *Die Ketzerverfolgungen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entstehung des Päpstlichen Ketzerinquisitionsgerichts* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1913, pp. iv, 176); and in L. Garzend's *L'Inquisition et l'Hérésie, Distinction de l'Hérésie Théologique et de l'Hérésie Inquisitoriale, à propos de l'Affaire Galilée* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1913, pp. xvi, 540, reviewed by E. Vacandard, *Revue des Questions Historiques,* April), which is an elaborate apology for the church in the Galileo case. *Die Ketzerpolitik der Deutschen Kaiser und Könige in den Jahren 1152–1254* by Dr. H. Köhler (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1914) supplements Dr. Theloe's work. J. Marx has published *L'Inquisition en Dauphiné, Étude sur le Développement et la Répression de l'Hérésie et de la Sorcellerie du XIV^e^ Siècle au Début du Règne de François I^er^* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. xxiii, 303).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: T. Nöldeke, *Die Tradition über das Leben Muhammeds* (Der Islam, V. 2); E. Jacobi, *Der Prozess im Decretum Gratiani und bei den ältesten Dekretisten* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); G. Baist, *Zur Interpretation der Brevium Exempla und des Capitulare de Villis* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Hakluyt Society has published a volume of Spanish and Portuguese documents entitled *New Light on Drake: a Collection of Documents relating to his Voyage of Circumnavigation, 1557–1580.* The translator and editor is Mrs. Zelia Nuttall, whose remarkable discoveries in the Inquisition and other papers in the archives of Mexico and in other collections we have already described.

The minor defects of *Christina of Denmark, Duchess of Milan and Lorraine, 1522–1590,* by Julia Cartwright (Mrs. Ady) are overbalanced by the knowledge and skill of the author in rendering a faithful portrait of a woman of no inconsiderable prominence in European affairs.

J. Susta has published the fourth and concluding volume of his *Die Römische Kurie und das Konzil von Trient unter Pius IV.* (Vienna, Hölder, 1914). A volume on *Saint Pie V., 1504–1572* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914) by Abbé G. Grente finds place in the series, *Les Saints.* The first volume of the *Correspondencia Diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el Pontificado de S. Pio V.* has been edited by L. Serrano (Rome, Istituto Pio IX., 1914). An important portion of the *Analecta Bollandiana,* XXXIII. 2, is occupied with a discussion, by Father François van Ortroy, of materials for the life of the same canonized pope Pius V.

The late Richard Waddington had practically completed before his death the fifth volume of *La Guerre de Sept Ans, Histoire Diplomatique et Militaire,* which has the sub-title, *Pondichéry, Villinghausen, Schweidnitz* (Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1914, pp. 451). Captain A. Dussauge has published under the auspices of the French general staff *Études sur la Guerre de Sept Ans: le Ministère de Belle-Isle, I. Krefeld et Lütterberg, 1758* (Paris, Fournier, 1914, pp. 486).

For the *Home University Library* Professor T. C. Smith has written *Wars between England and America.*

Several episodes in the diplomatic history of the Napoleonic period are dealt with in the following recent publications: R. Pétiet, *Gustave IV. Adolphe et la Révolution Française, Relations Diplomatiques de la France et de la Suède de 1792 à 1810, d'après des Documents d'Archives inédits* (Paris, Champion, 1914); W. Trummel, *Der Norddeutsche Neutralitätsverband, 1795–1807* (Hildesheim, Lax, 1913); M. Philippson, *Die Aeussere Politik Napoleons I.: der Friede von Amiens, 1802* (Leipzig, 1913, pp. 108); J. de la Tour, *Les Prémices de l'Alliance Franco-Russe, Deux Missions de Barthélemy de Lesseps à Saint-Petersburg, 1806–1807* (Paris, Perrin, 1914); F. Schmidt, *Sachsens Politik von Jena bis Tilsit, 1806–1807* (Leipzig, 1913, pp. vii, 100); F. Mehring, *1807–1812, Von Tilsit nach Tauroggen* (Stuttgart, Dietz, 1913); *Jean d'Ussel, Études sur l'Année 1813: la Défection de la Prusse: l'Intervention de l'Autriche* (2 vols., Paris, Plon, 1914); J. F. Hoff, *Die Mediatisiertenfrage in den Jahren 1813–1814* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1913, pp. xii, 127); and

Brendel, *Die Pläne einer Wiedergewinnung Elsass-Lothringens in den Jahren 1814 und 1815* (Strassburg, Heitz, 1914).

To the *Special Campaign* series, R. G. Burton has added *Napoleon's Invasion of Russia* (Macmillan).

M. Schalck de la Faverie of the Paris National Library is at work on a volume to be called *Napoléon et l'Amérique,* which is to discuss the interacting influence of France and America from the French Revolution to the First Empire.

It is to be expected that contributions and documents interesting to the student of American history will frequently be found in the new journal lately founded by the Franciscans of Spain, *Archivo Ibero-Americano,* devoted to the history of the Franciscans in Spain, Portugal, America, and the other missionary fields outside of Europe (Madrid, Paseo del Cisne, 12; subscription in foreign countries, 16 francs).

F. R. and P. Dareste have brought up to date their annotated French translations of *Les Constitutions Modernes, Recueil des Constitutions en Vigueur dans les divers États du Monde,* in a third edition (2 vols., Paris, Challamel, 1914).

The outbreak of the great war lends additional interest to such works as Professor Roland G. Usher's *Pan-Germanism* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1913) and Captain Henri Andrillon's *L'Expansion d'Allemagne* (Paris, Marcel Rivière, 1914). Both are primarily publicistic, but contain much interesting matter relating to recent history.

The present war has also given added interest to the following discussions of the problems of European diplomacy: A. Singer, *Geschichte des Dreibundes, mit einem Anhang—Der Inhalt des Dreibundes, eine Diplomatische Untersuchung von Hans F. Helmolt* (Leipzig, Rabinowitz, 1914, pp. viii, 293); H. Frederich, *Die Idee des Politischen Gleichgewichts* (Würzburg, Staudenraus, 1914, pp. 77); and M. Lecomte and C. Levi, *Neutralité Belge et Invasion Allemande, Histoire, Stratégie* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1914, pp. 608), which includes a bibliography.

The publication of *Mes Souvenirs, 1830–1914* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914) by Auguste Lalance, the Alsatian deputy whom Bismarck expelled from the Reichstag, attracted no little attention early in the present year. *L'Exode* (Paris, Hachette, 1914) by G. Delahache described the migration from Alsace-Lorraine after the cession. But the most notable successes in years in arousing public interest in the Alsace-Lorraine question have been the publications under the pseudonym, Oncle Hansi, especially the popular illustrated *Histoire d'Alsace* and *Mon Village* (Paris, Floury, 1913, 1914).

Many of the problems of European politics both internal and international at the beginning of 1914 have been discussed in articles in the *Revue Politique Internationale,* of which the first number was published in Paris in January. The outbreak of the present war has given these

articles a peculiar importance. Of similar significance are numerous articles in *Questions Diplomatiques et Coloniales, Revue de Politique Extérieure.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. d'Avenel, *Le Port des Lettres depuis Sept Siècles* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 1); W. Goetz, *Renaissance und Antike* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 2); G. B. Picotti, *La Pubblicazione e i primi Effetti della "Execrabilis" di Pio II.* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXVII. 1); E. Dürr, *Karl der Kühne und der Ursprung des Habsburgisch-Spanischen Imperiums* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 1); Imbart de la Tour, *Renaissance et Réforme: la Religion des Humanistes* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, June); M. Dubruel, *Le Pape Alexandre VIII. et les Affaires de France,* I. (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, April); L. Delavaud, *Scènes de la Vie Diplomatique au XVIII^e Siècle, 1712–1714,* I. (Revue du Dix-Huitième Siècle, April); L. G. Wickham Legg, *Torcy's Account of Matthew Prior's Negotiations at Fontainebleau* (English Historical Review, July); E. Nys, *Le Droit de la Nature et le Droit des Gens au XVIII^e Siècle* (Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée, XVI. 3); E. Tarle, *Deutsch-Französische Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zur Napoleonischen Zeit* (Schmollers Jahrbuch, XXXVIII. 2); M. Escoffier, *Les Instructions de Lord Castlereagh, Plénipotentiaire Britannique au Congrès de Châtillon, 1813* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July); P. Muret, *Alexandre II. et Napoléon III., d'après un Ouvrage Récent* [F. C. Roux] (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, March); Dr. Hesselbarth, *Die Urheberschaft der Uebereinkunft von Gastein* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 2); J. B. Scott, *The Declaration of London of February 20, 1909* (American Journal of International Law, April); P. von Mitrofanoff, *Offener Brief über das Verhältnis von Russland und Deutschland, mit Vor- und Nachwort des Herausgebers* [H. Delbrück] (Preussische Jahrbücher, June).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The Historical Association's *Annual Bulletin of Historical Literature,* no. 3, to be obtained from the secretary, Miss Curran, 6 South Square, Gray's Inn, London, presents in 43 pages a most useful survey, by competent authorities, of the leading books, mostly English and in English history, of the year 1913.

A *History of England and Greater Britain* by Professor Arthur L. Cross of the University of Michigan, in one large volume of 1165 pages, has just been published by the Macmillan Company.

The Macmillan Company has published *The Normans in England, 1066–1154,* by A. E. Bland (pp. 118), and *The Growth of Parliament and the War with Scotland, 1216–1307,* by W. D. Robieson.

The chief place in the *Analecta Bollandiana,* XXXIII. 2, is taken by the life of St. Lawrence O'Toole, archbishop of Dublin under Henry II., edited from the Codex Kilkenniensis by Dr. Charles Plummer.

The Canterbury and York Society is soon to publish the register of John Whyte, bishop of Winchester. Plans are also under way for further issues in the registers of John de Pontissara of Winchester, and Matthew Parker of Canterbury, and in those of the dioceses of Lincoln, London, Rochester, and Salisbury. A volume of *Visitations of Religious Houses, 1420–1426,* will form the extra part in 1914–1915.

The fourth volume of *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History* which Professor Vinogradoff is editing, contains "The History of Contract in Early English Equity", by Mr. W. T. Barbour, and "The Abbey of Saint-Bertin and its Neighbourhood, 900–1350", by G. W. Coopland.

Innocenz IV. und England (Berlin, Göschen, 1914) by Dr. L. Dehio is a contribution to the study of the reign of Henry III.

Mr. Evan Macleod Barron has gathered together and published as *The Scottish War of Independence: a Critical Study* (Nisbet and Company) articles which he has contributed to *The Inverness Courier.* These are chiefly controversial in tone, his thesis being that the Highlands have been neglected in Scottish history.

The Church, the State, and the Poor: a Series of Historical Studies, by Dr. W. Edward Chadwick (Robert Scott), is an attempt to show how to improve social conditions of the present and future by a study of such conditions in the past, but it can scarcely be said that the historical survey adds much to our knowledge of English social history.

The Royal Fishery Companies of the Seventeenth Century, by John R. Elder (Maclehose), is a substantial piece of work on this phase of the economic history of England.

Sulgrave Manor, the home of the ancestors of George Washington, has been purchased by funds subscribed in Great Britain, and in July was handed over with appropriate ceremonies to members of the centennial committee having charge of the celebration of one hundred years of peace between the United States and Great Britain, to be held as a gift to the American people.

A full and careful catalogue of the library of Samuel Pepys at Magdalene College, Cambridge, is being published in London by Sidgwick and Jackson. Part I., describing the "Sea Manuscripts", mostly material gathered together by Pepys for his proposed history of the navy, has been prepared by Dr. J. R. Tanner; part II., embracing the early printed books before 1558, by E. Gordon Duff.

The Oxford University Press announces *The Legislative Union of England and Scotland,* by Professor P. Hume Brown of Edinburgh.

Mr. George H. Perris's *The Industrial History of Modern England* (Kegan Paul) is not a book founded on extensive original researches, but fills a useful gap by a survey of the whole period from the Industrial Revolution.

The second series of *The Lord Advocates of Scotland,* by G. W. T. Omond (London, Andrew Melrose, 1914, pp. xxiv, 360), gives us his account of the part the Lord Advocates played in the history of Scotland from 1834 to 1880.

Lord Charles Beresford's autobiography, *A Sailor's Life,* containing his recollections of the Egyptian war and the Sudan campaign, is being edited by Mr. L. Hope Cornford.

Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw is the editor of a volume of lectures on the history of British colonization and its economic and political aspects. The contributors to the volume, which is entitled *King's College Lectures on Colonial Problems* (Macmillan), are Rev. T. J. Lawrence, who discusses the position of the colonies in international law, Sir John A. Cockburn, who deals with the Australian constitution, Sir Charles Lucas, whose subject is the Influence of Science on Empire, Professor H. E. Egerton, whose lecture, the Colonial Reforms of 1830, is perhaps the most purely historical of the volume, and Mr. Sidney Low, who writes on the Imperial Executive.

British government publications: *Calendar of the Justiciary Rolls of Proceedings in the Court of the Justiciar of Ireland,* preserved in the Public Record Office of Ireland, Edward I., part II., ed. James Mills; *Statute Rolls of the Parliament of Ireland,* 1–12 Edw. IV., ed. Henry F. Berry.

Other documentary publications: *Select Bills in Eyre, A. D. 1292–1333,* ed. W. C. Bolland (Selden Society); *Year-Books of 4 Edward II.* (A. D. 1310–1311), ed. G. J. Turner (Selden Society); *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters,* vol. I., *Apprentices' Entry Books, 1654–1694,* ed. Bower Marsh (the Company).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. W. C. Davis, *The Canon Law of England* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); H. W. C. Davis, *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey* (English Historical Review, July); E. Re, *La Compagnia dei Riccardi in Inghilterra e il suo Fallimento alla Fine del Sec. XIII.* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXVII. 1–2); Conyers Read, *English Foreign Trade under Elizabeth* [doc.] (English Historical Review, July); T. S. Graves, *The Political Use of the Stage during the Reign of James I.* (Anglia, XXXVIII. 1); E. R. Turner, *The Lords Justices of England* (English Historical Review, July); G. Neilson, *Scotstarvet's "Trew Relation",* III. (Scottish Historical Review, July); E. K. Broadus, *Poet Laureate and Historiographer Royal* (Nation, July 30); Yves Guyot, *J. Chamberlain et son Rôle Économique* (Journal des Économistes, July).

FRANCE

General review: G. Pagès and R. Guyot, *Histoire de France depuis 1660* (Revue Historique, July).

H. Gröhler has published a philological study—the first of its kind—*Ueber Ursprung und Bedeutung der Französischen Ortsnamen* (vol. I., Heidelberg, Winter, 1913, pp. xxiii, 377, reviewed by E. Gierach, *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur,* XLII. 6; by E. Clouzot, *Le Moyen Âge,* March). He deals with 70 Ligurian, 25 Iberian, 2 Phoenician, 8 Greek, 769 Gallic, and 487 Latin place-names. It is announced that the lectures of the late Professor Longnon on this subject are to be published. H. F. Delaborde will edit the lectures given at the College of France, and P. Marichal and L. Mirot those given at the École des Hautes Études.

Professor Camille Jullian of the College of France has used the author's manuscript and notes in revising and completing Fustel de Coulanges's *Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l'Ancienne France* in a new edition of which four volumes have appeared (Paris, Hachette, 1914).

Professor Paul Viard of the University of Lille has studied the *Histoire de la Dîme Ecclésiastique dans le Royaume de France* and has issued one volume on the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and another on the sixteenth (Paris, Picard, 1912, 1914).

Under the general title *Les Origines de la Réforme,* P. Imbart de la Tour has followed the volumes on *La France Moderne* and *L'Église Catholique,* by *L'Évangélisme, 1521–1538, Étude sur la Réforme Française avant Calvin* (Paris, Hachette, 1914). Local phases of the reformation in France are the subject of volumes by H. Patry on *Les Débuts de la Réforme Protestante en Guyenne, 1523–1559* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1913, pp. xlii, 300); by C. Oursel, entitled *Notes pour servir à l'Histoire de la Réforme en Normandie au Temps de François Ier* (Caen, Delesques, 1913, pp. 156); and by V. Chareton on *La Réforme et les Guerres Civiles en Vivarais, 1544–1632* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1913, pp. xii, 430).

The Société d'Histoire de France has recently issued two volumes dealing with the period of Mazarin: Henri Courteault's edition of the *Journal de Jean Vallier, Maître d'Hotel du Roi, 1648–1657*; and the second volume (1654–1659) of P. Marichal's edition of the *Mémoires du Maréchal de Turenne* (Paris, Renouard, 1913, 1914). Another volume of memoirs of the period is Count G. de Lhomel's edition of *Les Relations d'Antoine de Lumbres* (vol. II., 1656–1660, Paris, Plon, 1912). H. Coville has made an *Étude sur Mazarin et ses Démêlés avec le Pape Innocent X., 1644–1648* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. vii, 197); and L. M. Kotowitsch has published a thesis on *Die Staatstheorien im Zeitalter der Fronde, 1648–1652* (Aarau, Sauerlander, 1913, pp. xv, 134). An exhaustive thesis on *Les Dernières Années de Turenne, 1660–1675* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1914, pp. xxxix, 608) is by C. G. Picavet.

In the *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution Française,* A. Rebillon, professor in the Lycée of Rennes, has published an elaborate compilation, with an excellent and comprehensive introduction, on *La Situation Économique du Clergé à la Veille de la Révolution dans les Districts de Rennes, de Fougères, et de Vitré* (Paris, Leroux, 1913, pp. ccxxix, 780). A carefully prepared map shows the percentage of real property in each commune belonging to the Church—only four exceeded twenty per cent., and only eight more exceeded ten per cent. There are also excellent introductions with illustrative charts in L. Schwab, *Documents relatifs à la Vente des Biens Nationaux, District de Remiremont (Vosges),* and in G. Lefebvre, *Documents relatifs à l'Histoire des Subsistances dans le District de Bergues (Nord) pendant la Révolution,* tome I., which have recently been received, along with the third volume of E. Bridrey, *Cahiers de Doléances du Bailliage de Cotentin,* in the same series.

In *Rapports des Agents du Ministre de l'Intérieur dans les Départements, 1793—An II.* (tome I., Paris, Leroux, 1913, pp. xliv, 533), Pierre Caron has supplemented Professor Aulard's monumental publication of the correspondence of the deputies on mission under the Convention by publishing the reports to the minister of the interior of three sets of his executive agents sent out in 1793. The correspondence belongs mainly to the summer of 1793 and is most important as evidence of the state of public sentiment. The publication will be as complete as possible for the three sets of agents concerned, but has no relation to other national agents even of the same ministry. The volume is published in the *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France,* in which series there has also just appeared the third volume of A. Debidour's *Recueil des Actes du Directoire Exécutif,* for the period July 4–October 6, 1796.

Professor Fournier has used the recent literature and continued his own researches in thoroughly revising his well-known *Napoleon I.: eine Biographie* (3 vols., Vienna, Tempsky, 1914) for the third edition. Frédéric Masson deals with the year 1815 in the eleventh volume of *Napoléon et sa Famille* (Paris, Ollendorff, 1914) and expects to issue the twelfth and final volume shortly. *Napoléon et les Grand Généraux de la Révolution et de l'Empire* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914) is a study in the art of war by Count Lort de Sérignan. Max Grandwald has used the accounts by Jewish participants and observers in *Die Feldzüge Napoleons* (Vienna, Brunmüller, 1914, pp. viii, 310). F. J. MacCunnan has compiled a volume on *The Contemporary English View of Napoleon* (London, Bell, 1914, pp. viii, 311). The novelist Jehan d'Ivray has undertaken serious history in *Bonaparte et l'Égypte* (Paris, Lemerre, 1914). E. Welwert of the national archives has used the reports of Beugnot to Louis XVIII. in *Napoléon et la Police sous la Première Restauration* (Paris, Roger and Chernoviz, 1913). H. Conrad has arranged in chronological order the materials from the various St.

Helena diaries in *Napoleons Leben auf St. Helena, 1815–1821* (Stuttgart, Lutz, 1914).

The section for modern and contemporary history of the Committee on Historical and Scientific Works, under the ministry of public instruction, has begun the publication of a series of *Notices, Inventaires, et Documents.* The first volume contains *Documents sur l'Histoire Religieuse de la France pendant la Restauration, 1814–1830* (Paris, Rieder, 1913, pp. 271) calendared from the archives of the departments of the Bouches-du-Rhone and the Doubs by their respective archivists. The second volume contains *La Statistique Agricole de 1814* (*ibid.*, 1914, pp. xx, 579) reported by the archivists of each department in which the documents could be found.

M. Louis Halphen has recently published an excellent study, *L'Histoire en France depuis Cent Ans* (Armand Colin), in which he analyzes the reviving interest in history that followed the Restoration, and describes the work which the French government has done in publishing manuscripts, and the reorganization of history in the universities.

Volumes VIII. and IX. of *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870–1871, Recueil de Documents publié par le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères* (Paris, Ficker, 1914, pp. 487, 382) deal with the antecedents of the Seven Weeks' War, from March 16 to June 1, 1866. The main interest attaches to the correspondence of Benedetti from Berlin and in a less degree to the letters of Grammont from Vienna and of Malaret from Florence. The letters of the ministers at the lesser German capitals often furnish interesting side-lights.

The seventeenth and final volume of M. Ollivier's *L'Empire Libéral* is to be published shortly. Though written some fifteen or more years ago, M. Ollivier was in the midst of revising it when he died, and it still lacks a closing chapter on Sedan.

Among the patriotism-makers, published by the militarist agitators on the eve of the present war, were Captain Ledent's *Toutes les Victoires Françaises, 365 Jours, 797 Victoires, Pas un Jour sans Victoires* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914); C. Malo's *Souvenirs Héroïques de l'Armée Française* (Paris, Hachette, 1914, pp. 380); and the popular, illustrated series of *Les Grands Hommes de Guerre* (Paris, Chapelot) with volumes on *Napoléon* by Lt.-Col. Colin, *Murat* by A. de Tarlé, *Davout* by R. Peyronnet, *Ney* by R. Andriot, *Masséna* by E. Gachot, *Kléber* by Lt.-Col. Richard, and *Bugeaud* by A. de Penennrun.

Toward the close of 1913, E. d'Hauterive brought to the attention of the management of the French national archives the present condition of the documents which had been used by Professor Aulard in his *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public.* Professor Aulard promptly responded with an attack upon the management of the archives for the destruction of certain classes of documents without consulting the

archives commission of which he is chairman. Both complaints were investigated. It was found that the destruction of documents had been done as a matter of normal routine. The procedure and the documents destroyed are described by C. V. Langlois, "Les Suppressions de Papiers Inutiles aux Archives Nationales en 1913" (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* January). In the other case, the report was practically a condemnation of Professor Aulard though it was framed in the most conciliatory fashion. The affair has caused a renewal of the attacks upon Aulard's historical method and upon his scholarship which have been made intermittently during the past half dozen years. One of the most serious of these assaults is Laurentie, "Le Cas de M. Aulard, les Aventures d'un Historien Officiel" (*Correspondant,* March 10). The various French historical reviews have each given more or less space to the affair.

In the series *Les Vieilles Provinces de France,* recent issues are *Franche-Comté,* by L. Febvre; *Corse,* by L. Villat; and *Poitou,* by P. Boissonnade (Paris, Boivin, 1912–1914). The *Histoire de Bretagne* by A. de la Borderie and Barth-Socquet has been completed with the sixth volume (Rennes, Plihon and Hommay, 1914, pp. 563), which contains an index to the whole work. A. Oheix has published *Essais sur les Sénéchaux de Bretagne des Origines au XIV^e^ Siècle* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1913). Four volumes on *La Vie Urbaine de Douai au Moyen Âge* (Paris, Picard, 1914) are by G. Espinas.

In addition to brief articles on the history of Brittany, the *Annales de Bretagne* is publishing three important series of articles: S. Canal, *Les Origines de l'Intendance de Bretagne*; F. Quessette, *L'Administration Financière des États de Bretagne de 1689 à 1715*; and E. Sevestre, *Le Clergé Breton en 1801.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Héron de Villefosse, *Les Agents du Recensement dans les Trois Gaules* (Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France, LXXIII.); J. Flach, *La Normandie était-elle un Grand Fief de la Couronne avant le XII^e^ Siècle?* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, February); Hilda Johnstone, *The County of Ponthieu, 1279–1307* (English Historical Review, July); P. Viard, *L'Évolution de la Dîme Ecclésiastique en France aux XIV^e^ et XV^e^ Siècles* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); H. Sée, *La Question de la Vaine Pâture en France à la Fin de l' Ancien Régime* (Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale, VII. 1); M. Marion, *L'Imposition des ci-devant Privilégiés en 1789* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, February); C. Ballot, *La Politique Extérieure du Directoire d'après des Ouvrages Récents* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, March); A. Aulard, *Thiers, Historien de la Révolution Française* (La Révolution Française, June, July); A. Gourvitch, *Le Mouvement pour la Réforme Électorale, 1838–1841,*

I. (La Révolution de 1848, May); C. Benoist, *L'Homme de 1848* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, November, March); E. Ollivier, *La Fin de l'Empire* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15, July 1); Lieut. Peyronnet, *Ceux qui ont étudié Napoléon* (Journal des Sciences Militaires, April 11, 18, May 2, 9, 16, July 4, 11); A. Georges-Berthier, *L'Histoire des Sciences en France, à propos de la Suppression d'une Chaire* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, April).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

Father Fedele Savio, S.J., is practically making a beginning of an *Italia Sacra* of the completest and most scholarly kind, by the publication of a thick volume on the bishops of Milan, *Gli Antichi Vescovi d'Italia dalle Origini al 1300 descritti per Regioni: la Lombardia,* parte I., *Milano* (Florence, Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1913, pp. xx, 974). Not only are lists and lives of bishops presented, but also ten learned dissertations on appropriate themes. The volume for the rest of Lombardy is in press.

The first volume of *Il Regesto di Farfa,* by Gregorio di Catino, edited by I. Georgi and Count U. Balzani, has been issued as the first number of the *Biblioteca della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* (Rome, Loescher, 1914). The publication of this compilation will require four volumes. In the series *Regesta Chartarum Italiae,* the eleventh and twelfth numbers are the first volume of G. Zucchetti's edition of the *Liber Largitorius vel Notarius Monasterii Pharphensis*; and the first volume of the *Regestum Mantuannm* edited by P. Torelli (Rome, Loescher, 1913–1914). The sixth and seventh numbers of P. Sella's *Corpus Statutorum Italicorum* are the first volume of the *Statuti del Lago Maggiore e della Val d'Ossola,* edited by E. Anderloni and P. Sella, and the first volume of the *Statuti di Valdelsa,* edited by A. Latini (*ibid.,* 1914). Other recent documentary publications are *Lo Statuto della Corporazione dei Fabbri del 1244* (Modena, 1914), edited by Franchini; the first volume of *Documenti delle Relazioni tra Carlo I. d'Angiò e la Toscana* (Florence, 1914), edited by S. Terlizzi; the fourth volume (1567–1620) of the *Codex Diplomaticus Ord. S. Augustini Papiae* (Pavia, 1913); and *Le Pergamene di Barletta dell' Archivio Capitolare, 897–1285* (Trani, Vecchi, 1914), edited by F. Nitti di Vito, as the eighth volume of the *Codice Diplomatico Barese.*

The history of Norman administrative measures has received a substantial addition in Miss Evelyn Jamison's *The Norman Administration of Apulia and Capua, more especially Roger II. and William I., 1127–1166,* volume VI. of the *Papers* of the British School at Rome. The work is done with adequate scholarship and insight.

J. Pacheu's *Jacopone de Todi, Frère Mineur Franciscain, 1230–1306, Auteur Présumé du Stabat Mater* (Paris, Tralin, 1914); A. d'Ancona's *Jacopone da Todi, il Giullare di Dio del Secolo XIII.* (Todi, Atanòr,

1914, pp. 116) and Professor B. Brugnoli's critical edition of *Le Satire di Jacopone da Todi* (Florence, Olschki, 1914, pp. cxl, 428) will serve to keep green the memory of that thirteenth-century worthy. Biographies of medieval Italian churchmen include W. Franke's *Romuald von Camaldoli und seine Reformtätigkeit zur Zeit Ottos III.* (Berlin, Ebering, 1913, pp. vii, 255); Abbé R. Morçay's *Saint Antonin, Fondateur du Couvent de Saint-Marc, Archevêque de Florence, 1389–1459* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914, pp. xxxii, 504); and J. Schnitzer's *Savonarola im Streite mit seinem Orden und mit seinem Kloster* (Munich, Leemann, 1914).

A. Pingaud is the author of two volumes on *Bonaparte, Président de la République Italienne* (Paris, Perrin, 1914, pp. xxix, 491; 535). Bonaparte's minister of finance in Italy from 1802 to 1814 is the subject of a biographical sketch, *Il Ministro Prina, Cento Anni dopo la sua Morte,* by Dr. L. Ratti (Milan, 1914, pp. 73). The papal side of Napoleon's Italian policy receives new light from E. Ruck's *Die Sendung des Kardinals de Bayane nach Paris, 1807–1808, eine Episode aus der Politik Napoleons I. und Pius VII.* (Heidelberg, 1913).

The Italian National Society for the History of the Risorgimento, after publishing seven volumes of the review *Il Risorgimento Italiano,* has changed the title of its official organ to *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento* (Città di Castello, S. Lapi). Its editor is Professor Giuseppe Gallavresi of Milan. The former review, *Il Risorgimento Italiano* (Turin, Bocca), has been taken over by Senator T. Palamenghi-Crispi.

In the fourth edition (Milan, 1914), P. Orsi's *L'Italia Moderna* is continued to 1913. A similar work is M. Rosi's *Storia Contemporanea d'Italia dalle Origini del Risorgimento ai Giorni Nostri* (Turin, 1914, pp. viii, 464). The years, 1891–1894, are covered in the sixth volume of P. Vigo's *Annali d'Italia, Storia degli ultimi Trent' Anni del Secolo XIX.* (Milan, 1913). The years 1899–1909 are the *Dieci Anni di Vita Italiana* described by F. Papafava (2 vols., Bari, Laterza, 1913, pp. xvi, 402; 430). The problem of *L'Italia nell' Egeo* (Rome, Provenzani, 1913, pp. 290) has been discussed by G. De Frenzi.

In *Sevilla en el Siglo XIII.* (Madrid, Torres, 1913, pp. 255, cccxxxviii), A. Ballesteros has appended to his text a wealth of documents.

L'Astronomie Nautique au Portugal à l'Époque des Grandes Découvertes (Bern, M. Drechsel, 1912, pp. 285, reviewed by R. Sciama, *Revue des Études Juives,* January) is a notable study by J. Bensaude, based upon three Portuguese texts discovered in a hitherto overlooked incunabulum in the Royal Library at Munich. He apparently proves the use of the astrolabe at much earlier dates than previously supposed. He explains how John II. of Portugal secured Brazil as well as the route to the Indies in the Bull of Demarcation and why he neglected Columbus and his discoveries. An appendix gives a chronological list of geographical discoveries from 1290 to 1529.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. R. Thayer, *Risorgimento History* (The Nation, July 2); G. Capasso, *Dandolo, Morosini, Manara, 1848–1849* (Nuova Antologia, May 16); M. Riccio, *Francesco Crispi, la Sardegna e la Sicilia* (*ibid.*, June 16); E. Re, *Archivi Inglesi e Storia Italiana* (Archivio Storico Italiano, 1913); G. Cirot, *Florian de Ocampo, Chroniste de Charles-Quint* (Bulletin Hispanique, XVI. 3); C. Cambronero, *La Reina Gobernadora, Crónicas Políticas de 1833 a 1840* (La España Moderna, May, June, July).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Professor G. von Below discusses *Die Allgemeinen Fragen* in the first volume of *Der Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters, ein Grundriss der Deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, 1914, pp. xx, 387). In an article, *Landeshoheit und Niedergericht* (Deutsche Literaturzeitung, July 11), Professor von Below again attacks the opposing theories of Professor Seeliger which appear in the two theses reviewed in the article. These theses are *Das Tägliche Gericht, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Niedergerichtsbarkeit im Mittelalter* (Breslau, Marcus, 1913, pp. 138) by Dr. K. Weimann, and *Niedere Gerichtsbarkeit und Grafengewalt im Badischen Linzgau während des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (*ibid.*, 1913, pp. x, 117). Another constitutional problem is investigated in von Dungern's *War Deutschland ein Wahlreich?* (Liepzig, Meiner, 1913) in which it is contended that the electoral choice was virtually limited by a well-understood rule of succession.

R. Scholz has published a volume of comment and a volume of texts of *Unbekannte Kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern* in the *Bibliothek des Königlich Preussischen Historischen Instituts in Rom* (Rome, 1913, 1914). R. Moeller has a volume on *Ludwig der Bayer und die Kurie im Kampf um das Reich* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914).

Dr. J. Schairer has used Augsburg sources in studying *Das Religiöse Volksleben am Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. viii, 136) and Dr. M. Haussler has given account of the Dominican, *Felix Fabri aus Ulm und seine Stellung zum Geistigen Leben seiner Zeit* (*ibid.*, 1914, pp. vii, 119). Both theses are published in Professor Goetz's series of *Beiträge*. Dr. Paul Roth has an interesting thesis on the occasional sheets of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as forerunners of the modern newspaper, *Die Neuen Zeitungen in Deutschland im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (*ibid.*, 1914, pp. vi, 86, reviewed by M. Spahn, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, July 18, 25).

Georg Mentz has published a useful manual on *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation, der Gegenreformation und des Dreissigjährigen Krieges, 1493–1648* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1913, pp. viii, 479).

The newest issue in Dr. Aloys Meister's *Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft,* and a manual for which there is extensive need on the part of American teachers, is *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart,* by Dr. Fritz Hartung of Halle (Leipzig, Teubner, pp. 174). The statements are brief, but are accompanied with a wealth of references to monographs.

In L. von Pastor's *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes,* the third part of the ninth volume is G. Schuhmann's *Die Berner Ketzertragödie im Lichte der Neueren Forschung und Kritik*; and the first and second parts of the tenth volume are J. B. Götz's *Die Religiöse Bewegung in der Oberpfalz von 1520 bis 1560, auf Grund Archivalisher Forschungen* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1912–1914).

Recent biographical studies belonging to the Reformation period include A. Brandt, *Johann Ecks Predigertätigkeit an U. L. Frau zu Ingolstadt, 1525–1542* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1914); G. Anrich, *Martin Bucer* (Strassburg, Trübner, 1914, pp. v, 147); E. Giran, *Sebastian Castellion et la Réforme Calviniste* (Paris, Hachette, 1914); and Professor E. Baehler, *Nikolaus Zurkinden von Bern, 1506–1588, ein Vertreter der Toleranz* (Zürich, Beer, 1912, pp. 199).

Dr. Julius Glücklich of the Bohemian University of Prague has published under the auspices of the Francis Joseph Academy of Arts and Sciences (Prague, 1908–1912) the very valuable correspondence and papers of Václav Budovec of Budova, 1580–1619. Václav Budovec was the maker of the famous Letter of Majesty and the leader of the movement for unity among the Protestants of Bohemia before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. The correspondence is in Latin, Bohemian, and German, and includes letters to and from Beza, Mornay du Plessis, and others.

R. Koser has issued the initial volume of a *Geschichte der Brandenburgisch-Preussischen Politik* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1914). In Schuster's *Geschichte des Preussischen Hofes,* E. Bleich has written the volume on *Der Hof des Königs Friedrich Wilhelm II. und Friedrich Wilhelm III.* (Berlin, Voss, 1914). For Berlin and the political and intellectual situation in the time of Frederick William II. there is much useful material in Joseph Hay's *Staat, Volk, und Weltbürgertum in der Berlinischen Monatschrift von Friedrich Gedike und Johann Erich Biester, 1783–1796* (Berlin, Haude and Spener, 1913, pp. 83).

The period since Waterloo is covered in the second volume of Freiherr von der Goltz's *Kriegsgeschichte Deutschlands im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Berlin, Bondi, 1914, pp. xxxi, 654). About half the volume relates to the war of 1870. *Le Service d'État-Major en Campagne, les Quartiers-Généraux et les État-Majors Allemands en 1870* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914) is a thorough study by Colonel Tourloge.

Dr. Jan Heidler of the Bohemian University of Prague has written an important monograph entitled: *Antonin Springer a Česká Politika v Letech 1848–1850* (Prague, 1914). This study is founded on hitherto unpublished documents, for the most part memoirs and letters of such leaders in Bohemian and Austrian politics as Palacký, Rieger, Pinkas, and Springer during the years when Springer still believed in federalism in contrast to the point of view he assumed later in his *Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1863–1865).

Prince von Bülow contributed a notable article on "Deutsche Politik" to the first volume of *Deutschland unter Kaiser Wilhelm II.* (Berlin, Hobbing, 1914, pp. 1–136, reviewed by P. Hiltebrandt, *Deutsche Rundschau,* May; French translation by M. Herbette, Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1914). *Die Deutsche Innere Politik unter Kaiser Wilhelm II.* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1913, pp. ix, 342) by W. von Massow, and Captain B. Serrigny's *L'Évolution de l'Empire Allemand de 1871 jusqu' à nos Jours* (Paris, Perrin, 1913, pp. vi, 331) are additional volumes on the reign of the present kaiser.

The judgments of history are no doubt sure, but the judgments of historians are subject to revision, sometimes deadly in its promptness, by new events. That the timeliness of Professor R. Charmatz, *Geschichte der Auswärtigen Politik Oesterreichs im 19. Jahrhundert* (vol. II., 1848–1908, Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. vi, 136), in the series *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt,* was quite unpremeditated is all too clear from the present absurdity of the "Schlusswort", which was good reading three months ago.

The *Oesterreichische Rundschau* published an illustrated supplement of over a hundred pages in honor of the fiftieth birthday of *Erzherzog Franz Ferdinand, Unser Thronfolger.*

P. Dengel has published *Das Oesterreichische Historische Institut in Rom, 1901–1913* (Vienna, Herder, 1914, pp. 99) in honor of the sixtieth birthday of Ludwig von Pastor. The pamphlet contains a bibliography of the writings of Pastor and of the publications of the Austrian Historical Institute at Rome during the twelve years of Pastor's directorship.

The following recent volumes on Austrian local history are of interest: von Thallóczy, *Studien zur Geschichte Bosniens und Serbiens im Mittelalter* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914); H. Grossmann, *Oesterreichs Handelspolitik mit Bezug auf Galizien in der Reformperiode, 1772–1790* (Vienna, Konegen, 1914); V. Zagarski, *François Racki et la Renaissance Scientifique et Politique de la Croatie, 1828–1894* (Paris, Hachette, 1913); and V. Brunelli, *Storia della Città di Zara dai Tempi più rimoti fino al 1815, compilata sulle Fonti* (vol. I., Venice, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Eichmann, *Die Exkommunikation Philipps von Schwaben* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXV. 2); G. von Below, *Handwerk und Hofrecht, eine Entgegnung* (Vierteljahr-

schrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1); P. Kalkoff, *Die Bulle "Exsurge"* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXV. 2); J. Gottschick *Luthers Theologie* (Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XXIV., Ergänzungsheft I.); O. Winckelmann, *Ueber die ältesten Armenordnungen der Reformationszeit, 1522–1525* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 2); A. Meister, *Die Wirkung des Wirtschaftlichen Kampfes zwischen Frankreich und England, 1791–1813, auf Westfalen* (Zeitschrift für Vaterlandische Geschichte und Altertumskunde Westfalens, LXXI.); H. Delbrück, *Neues über 1813* (Preussische Jahrbücher, July); R. Fester, *Die Genesis der Emser Depesche,* I., II., III. (Deutsche Rundschau, June, July, August); A. Haas, *Das Moderne Zeitungswesen in Deutschland* (Volkswirtschaftliche Zeitfragen, XXXVI. 1); F. Curschmann, *Die Entwicklung der Historisch-Geographischen Forschung in Deutschland durch Zwei Jahrhunderte,* I. (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, XII. 2); C. Ballod, *Deutsche Volksernährung im Kriege* (Preussische Jahrbücher, July); E. Ott, *Das Eindringen des Kanonischen Rechts, seine Lehre und Wissenschaftliche Pflege in Böhmen und Mähren während des Mittelalters* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); F. Ilwof, *Der ständische Landtag des Herzogtums Steiermark unter Maria Theresia und ihren Söhnen* (Archiv für Oesterreichische Geschichte, CIV. 1); E. Chapuisat, *Comment Genève devint Ville Suisse* (Revue de Paris, July 1).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The latest issue in Professors Cramer and Pijper's *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* (the Hague, Nijhoff, pp. xi, 723) is part X., consisting of the writings of Dirk Philipsz., of date from 1564 to 1619.

In the *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis,* n. s., XI. 1, Mr. W. Mallinckrodt presents, in a biography of Sicco Tjaden of Groningen, a contribution of considerable value to the history of pietism.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Van der Essen, *Le Progrès du Luthéranisme et du Calvinisme dans le Monde Commercial d'Anvers et l'Espionnage Politique du Marchand Philippe Dauxy, Agent secret de Marguerite de Parme, en 1566–1567* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1); E. Vlietinck, *Le Rapprochement Néerlando-Belge* (Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée, XVI. 3); F. Hoffmann, *Niederländisch-Ostindien im letzten Jahrhundert* (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, July).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

Lauritz Weibull has continued in *Historisk-Kritisk Metod och Nordisk Medeltidsforskning* (Lund, Gleerup, 1913, pp. 95) the discussion of the historical value of the saga-literature which he opened in his *Kritiska Undersökningar.*

An interesting discussion of the Cyril-Methodius question will be found in *Die Wahrheit über die Slavenapostel* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1913, pp. 127) by A. Brückner.

The third volume of L. Kulczycki's *Geschichte der Russischen Revolution* (Gotha, Perthes, 1914, pp. viii, 496), German translation from the original Polish, deals with the period 1886–1900.

In January appeared the first number of the monthly *Bulletin de l'Institut pour l'Étude de l'Europe Sud-Orientale*, edited by Professor N. Jorga, as the organ of the newly founded Institutul de Studii Sudosteuropene of Bucharest. Articles relating to the geography, archaeology, and history of Rumania and neighboring lands are printed in Rumanian, French, or German.

Le Siège de Constantinople en 1453 (Paris, Plon, 1914) is an exhaustive study by G. Schlumberger.

The Struggle for Scutari (*Turk, Slav, and Albanian*) by Miss M. Edith Durham (London, Longmans, 1914, pp. 320) belongs to the class called *mémoires pour servir*. The writer, occupied mostly with relief work in North Albania during the years of warfare, details the story of 1911 and 1912 with Albanian and anti-Montenegrin sympathies, in a narrative of extraordinary interest, filled with the horrors of warfare, and strongly marked by the sense of having played a highly important part in what went on.

The Austro-Hungarian ministry of foreign affairs has published a volume of *Diplomatische Aktenstücke* (Vienna, 1914) relating to Balkan affairs from August, 1912, to November, 1913. The first publication of the German general staff on the Balkan wars treats *Die Ereignisse auf dem Thrazischen Kriegsschauplatz bis zum Waffenstillstand* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914, pp. vi, 160, 6 maps). General Fitchev, the chief of the Bulgarian general staff during the Balkan wars, has prepared *La Guerre Turco-Bulgare d'après les Relations et Documents Officiels de l'État-Major Bulgare* (2 vols., Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914). Other new publications on the Balkan wars are: G. Rémond and A. de Penennrun, *Sur les Lignes de Feu, le Carnet de Champ de Bataille du Colonel Djemal Bey, de Kirk-Kilissé à Tchataldja* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914); and M. Pickthall, *With the Turk in Wartime* (London, Dent, 1914).

Recent and present conditions and problems in the Turkish Empire are described and discussed in B. G. Baker, *The Passing of the Turkish Empire in Europe* (New York, 1913, pp. 309); G. Gaulis, *La Ruine d'un Empire: Abd-ul-Hamid, ses Amis et ses Peuples* (Paris, Colin, 1913, pp. xi, 359); Ali Vahbi Bey, *Pensées et Souvenirs de l'ex-Sultan Abdul Hamid* (Paris, Attinger, 1914); and V. Bérard, *La Révolution Turque* (Paris, Colin, 1913).

Recent books on Albania, its history, conditions, and problems, include F. Gibert, *Les Pays d'Albanie et leur Histoire* (Paris, Rosier,

1914); G. Louis-Jaray, *Au Jeune Royaume d'Albanie, ce qu'il a été, ce qu'il est* (Paris, Hachette, 1914); and S. Copčević, *Das Fürstentum Albanien, seine Vergangenheit, Ethnographischen Verhältnisse, Politische Lage und Aussichten für die Zukunft* (Berlin, Paetel, 1914, pp. 356).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Bugge, *Der Untergang der Norwegischen Schiffahrt im Mittelalter* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1); R. Dmowski, *The Political Evolution of Poland,* III. (Russian Review, May); Z. Balycki, *The Revival of Political Thought in Poland* (*ibid.*); V. Dourdenevski, *Le Régime de la Presse en Russie et son Projet de Réforme* (Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique, April); B. E. Schmitt, *The Balkan Revolution* (Western Reserve University Bulletin, new series, XVII. 3); S. P. Phocas-Cosmetatos, *Le Relèvement Économique de la Grèce* (Revue de Paris, July 1).

AFRICA

Professor Stéphane Gsell's *Histoire Ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord* (Paris, Hachette), which promises to be a most complete and satisfactory general survey, will consist of six volumes, extending to the Arab conquest. The first, which has already appeared, covers the geographical setting, the stone age, the Phoenician settlement, and the rise of the Carthaginian empire.

Various phases of North African history and politics are described in G. Marcais, *Les Arabes en Berberie du XI^e^ au XIV^e^ Siècle* (Paris, Leroux, 1914, pp. 770); G. Esquer (editor), *Correspondance du Duc de Rovigo, Commandant en Chef de Corps d'Occupation d'Afrique, 1831–1833* (vol. I., Algiers, Jourdan, 1914, pp. vi, 694); E. Lopez Alarcon, *Melilla, 1909, Crónica de un Testigo* (Madrid, Alvarez, 1913, pp. 416); A. Servier, *Le Nationalisme Musulman en Égypte, en Tunisie, en Algérie* (Constantine, Boët, 1913); and G. Sarkissian, *Le Soudan Égyptien, Étude sur le Droit International Public* (Paris, Larose, 1913, pp. 150).

The literature relating to the Italian occupation of Tripoli includes C. Causa, *La Guerra Italo-Turca e la Conquista della Tripolitania* (Florence, Salani, 1913, pp. 842); R. d'Andrea, *La Conquista Libica* (Naples, Bideri, 1913, pp. xvi, 306); A. Dauzat, *L'Expansion Italienne* (Paris, Fasquelle, 1914, pp. 298); G. Sabotta, *Politica di Penetrazione in Africa, l'Islam e l'Italia* (Rome, Lux, 1913, pp. 147); W. K. McClure, *Italy in North Africa* (London, Constable, 1913, pp. 320); A. Malvezzi, *L'Italia e l'Islam in Libia* (Florence, Treves, 1913, pp. 270); and P. V. de Regny, *Libya Italica* (Milan, Hoepli, 1913, pp. 214).

On the French conquest of Morocco, there have appeared Hubert-Jacques, *Les Journées Sanglantes de Fez* (Paris, Chapelot, 1913); L. Capperon, *Au Secours de Fès* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1913, pp. 246); Captain Guillaume, *Sur la Frontière Marocaine* (*ibid.*, pp. 244); Lieutenant Segonds, *La Chaouia et sa Pacification* (*ibid.*, pp. 144); Lieuten-

ant Kuntz, *Souvenirs de Campagne au Maroc* (*ibid.*, pp. 616); Captain Feline, *L'Artillerie au Maroc, Campagnes en Chaouia* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1912, pp. vii, 318); Lieutenant-Colonel Magnin, *Campagne de Tadla* (*ibid.*, pp. 80); Captain Cornet, *À la Conquête du Maroc Sud avec la Colonne Mangin* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. viii, 334); and L. Voinot, *Oudjda et Amalat.*

The French protectorate and work of administration in Morocco are described and discussed in P. Khorat, *Scènes de la Pacification Marocaine* (Paris, Perrin, 1914, pp. iv, 307); R. Bernard and C. Aymard, *L'Oeuvre Française au Maroc, Avril 1912–Septembre 1913* (Paris, Hachette, 1914, pp. x, 254); G. Lebre, *De l'Établissement du Protectorat de la France au Maroc et spécialement du Régime Foncier* (Paris, Pedone, 1914); G. Desroches, *Le Maroc, Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain* (Paris, Flammarion, 1914); M. Revilliod, *L'Organisation Intérieure des Pays de Protectorat, son Application au Maroc* (Paris, Rousseau, 1913); and R. van Loo, *La Rénovation du Maroc* (Paris, Lebègue, 1913, pp. 220).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir H. H. Johnston, *A Survey of the Ethnography of Africa and the Former Racial and Tribal Migrations in that Continent* (Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, July–December, 1913); C. Grilli, *Gli Esperimenti Coloniali nell' Africa Neolatina* (Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali, December, January, February, March).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

A welcome addition to works of reference is *The China Year Book*, for 1914 (Dutton), containing in addition to articles on the history of the year, a "Who's Who" almost twice as large as that of the volume for 1913.

A document of much interest to the student of the opening up of Japan to western civilization is *The Life of Takano Nagahide*, by Osada Kenjiro, translated and edited by the late Dr. Daniel C. Greene of Tokyo, who has supplied a useful introduction. The importance of the life of Takano (1804–1850) consists in his relation to western learning as acquired through Dutch means long before Perry's visit, and in the valuable work he did, against warm opposition, in preparing the way toward the advent of new Japan. The translation appears in the *Transactions* of the Asiatic Society of Japan (XLI., part III.) for August, 1913.

The publication of the *Guerre Russo-Japonaise, 1904–1905*, prepared by the Russian general staff and translated by the French general staff, has reached the battle of Mukden, which is described in the first part of the fifth volume (Paris, Chapelot, 1913, pp. ix, 828, and atlas). The *Schlacht bei Mukden, 25 Februar bis 3 März 1905* (Berlin, Mittler, 1913, pp. vi, 118) is the latest publication of the German general staff regarding the same war. *Betrachtungen über den Russisch-Japanischen Krieg* is the third part of Freiherr von Freytag-Loringhoven's *Die Führung in*

den neuesten Kriegen, Operatives und Taktisches (Berlin, Mittler, 1913, pp. vi, 154). Commandant Janet has written an *Étude sur les Opérations du Groupe de l'Est à la Bataille de Chaho, le Commandement, la Cavalerie* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914, pp. 115). In *Les Derniers Jours du "Sebastopol" à Port Arthur* (Paris, Challamel, 1914, pp. 148), Commandant de Balincourt has published the notes of N. O. von Essen, the commander of the ship.

Recent events in China are narrated and discussed in J. Rodes, *Dix Ans de Politique Chinoise, le Céleste Empire avant la Révolution* (Paris, Alcan, 1914); F. Farjenel, *À Travers la Révolution Chinoise* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. vi, 402); and A. Maybon, *La République Chinoise* (Paris, Colin, 1914, pp. xix, 268).

A. Leclère has written an *Histoire du Cambodge depuis le Premier Siècle de Notre Ère* (Paris, Geuthner, 1913, pp. xii, 547).

The unpublished history of Fernão de Queiroz has been the principal source used by P. E. Pierio in his *Ceylon: the Portuguese Era*, a history of the island from 1505 to 1658, published at Colombo by the Colombo Apothecaries' Company.

War and Sport in India, 1802–1806: an Officer's Diary (Heath, Cranton and Ouseley) throws some light on the campaigns under General Lake.

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The European work of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has been seriously affected by the war. Professor W. I. Hull, after one month's work in the Dutch archives, returned to the United States. Professor Golder has however been able to continue his work in the archives of Petrograd (St. Petersburg), and will soon make a beginning in those of Moscow. Mr. Leland remained in Paris till the early days of September, conducting under great difficulties his own work and that of others, but has now been obliged to return to the United States. The outbreak of war, by its effects on the supply of suitable paper, delayed for a time the large undertaking in photographic reproduction which was to be a part of Mr. F. S. Philbrick's summer campaign in Seville, but it has since gone forward, and he has made large progress in the Audiencias section of the Archives of the Indies. Mr. R. R. Hill's volume on the Papeles de Cuba is nearly completed in manuscript. Professor Faust's *Guide to the Materials for American History in Swiss and Austrian Archives* is finished, and will soon go to the printer. In the work on the *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States*, the Department will have for the next four months the assistance of Professor R. H. Whitbeck of the University of Wisconsin. From the beginning of November to the beginning of May it will, as already announced, have the great ben-

efit of the presence of Admiral Mahan as a "research associate" of the Institution. The second volume of Professor Charles M. Andrews's *Guide to the Materials for American History, to 1783, in the Public Record Office* has been published, completing a notable and laborious service on his part to the cause of colonial history, and the series of the Department's London guides.

The first two volumes of the *Cyclopedia of American Government,* edited by Professors McLaughlin and Hart, have come from the press (Appleton), the third is on the point of appearing.

With a view apparently to the Congress of Americanists which had been expected to be held in Washington, October 5–10, Professor Henri Cordier of Paris has issued a volume entitled *Mélanges Américains* (Paris, Maisonneuve) comprising twenty-eight papers of various value in the field of American studies, with special reference to archaeology and ethnography.

Professor Albert H. Sanford of the State Normal School, La Crosse, Wisconsin, has brought out through A. J. Nystrom and Company a set of thirty-two *American History Maps,* illustrating the more important phases of American history from the beginning of exploration to the present time. The maps contain numerous special features.

Among the recent accessions of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress are: the papers of Edmund Roberts, 1829–1836, a body of manuscripts pertaining to the early diplomatic history of the United States in the Orient, and the negotiation of treaties with the United States in that region; miscellaneous papers of Judge Alfred Roman, of Louisiana, being war telegrams and correspondence of General P. G. T. Beauregard, 1861–1890; various miscellaneous accounts, bills, and memoranda of expenses of the Randolph family, 1760–1860. Additional transcripts from documents in the Public Record Office and British Museum, London, have been received; and also transcripts from archives in Paris, in Seville, and in St. Petersburg.

Professor J. A. Woodburn has brought out a revised and enlarged edition of his *Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States* (Putnam).

The sixth edition of *The Tariff History of the United States,* by Professor F. W. Taussig, has come from G. P. Putnam's Sons (pp. xi, 465). Though the entire text has suffered some changes, the edition gains additional value from a chapter of forty pages on the tariff of 1913, which recounts briefly the events preceding the enactment of this tariff, the chief features of the tariff itself, and the probable effects, dwelling specially on the exaggerated importance placed upon the changes involved, the result, he points out, of the purely political prominence which the tariff question has attained in this country.

Mr. Oscar G. T. Sonneck, chief of the Division of Music in the Library of Congress, has followed up his report of 1909 on the history of

the Star Spangled Banner, Hail Columbia, America, and Yankee Doodle by a more special treatment (pp. 115, and 25 plates) of the history of the first of these, revised and enlarged from the previous report, and dealing with both the history of the air and that of the words.

The much-belated December number of the *Magazine of History* contains a biographical sketch, by Mary Boudinot Church, of Elias Boudinot, the Cherokee (1800?–1839), a letter written by Captain C. H. Heyer from Mexico in January, 1848, and a part of a letter from General Zachary Taylor to Jefferson Davis, February 16, 1848. The January number contains extracts from the diary of a British officer in Boston in 1775, hitherto unpublished.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The Peabody Museum of Harvard University has recently published, as no. 3 of volume V. of its *Memoirs,* an account of the Museum expedition of 1909–1910, by Alfred M. Tozzer, entitled *A Preliminary Study of the Pre-Historic Ruins of Nakum, Guatemala.*

Mr. William H. Babcock's *Early Norse Visits to North America,* a Smithsonian publication (no. 2138, pp. 213), is a valuable sifting of traditions and probabilities, with numerous maps and charts.

Dr. F. Oppliger presented as his thesis at the University of Bern, *Geschichte der Kolonialen Demarkation zwischen Spanien und Portugal, 1493–1750* (Biel, Schuler, 1913, pp. 68).

The Exodus of the Loyalists from Penobscot to Passamaquoddy, one of Professor Wilbur H. Siebert's excellent studies of the Loyalists, constitutes the April number of the *Ohio State University Bulletin* (vol. XVIII., no. 26, pp. 43).

Imperialistische und Pazifistische Strömungen in den Politik der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, 1776–1815 (Heidelberg, Winter, 1914) is the title of a thesis by Dr. Gertrud Philippi, published as number 45 of the *Heidelberger Abhandlungen.*

Mr. Warren K. Moorehead of Phillips Andover Academy, a member of the Board of Indian Commissioners, expects to issue in the winter *The Indian: a History, 1800–1914,* in which will be presented an historical narrative of Indian events within the period named, and an account of the present condition of the American Indian. After the finishing of this book, Mr. Moorehead expects to prepare other volumes going backward into the earlier periods of Indian history.

The third number of the *Osteuropäische Forschungen* is *Die Russisch-Amerikanische Handels-Kompagnie bis 1825* by Dr. H. Pilder (Berlin, Göschen, 1914).

Claims as a Cause of the Mexican War, by Dr. Clayton C. Kohl, has been brought out as *New York University Series of Graduate School*

Studies, no. 2 (New York, the University, pp. viii, 96). It is in effect a comprehensive history of the negotiations between the United States and Mexico between 1829 and 1848, with especial attention to the place which the claims of the United States against Mexico occupied in the policies of the several administrations and the extent to which they gave rise to war. The author reaches the conclusion that Mexico's one great grievance was the supposed desire of the United States for territory, while the only fundamental and logical grievance which the United States had against Mexico resided in the claims and that they constituted a just grievance. In addition to the mass of official and other publications relating to the subject, the author has made use to some extent of manuscript sources, such as the Jackson and Van Buren papers, Polk's Diary (since published), and manuscripts in the Department of State. Brief statements of the claims as drawn up in July, 1836, and July, 1837, are appended, as is also a bibliography.

The War with Mexico, 1846–1848, "a select bibliography *on* [*sic*] the causes, conduct, and the political aspect of the war, together with a select list of books and other printed material on the resources, economic conditions, politics, and government of the Republic of Mexico, and the characteristics of the Mexican people, with annotations and an index", has been brought out in Washington (*Professional Memoirs,* Washington Barracks). The compiler is H. E. Haferkorn.

The Chicago Historical Society has published an address on *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates* delivered before the society by Mr. Horace White, who attended most of the debates as a journalist, and has many interesting things to report.

The Navy Department has brought out volume XXVI. (pp. xvii, 915), of the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion,* edited by Mr. Charles W. Stewart of the department. It consists of material relating to the naval forces on Western waters from March 1 to December 31, 1864.

It is announced that George W. Jacobs and Company will issue this fall a new biography of General Grant, by Spencer Adam.

Recollections of a Maryland Confederate Soldier and Staff Officer under Johnston, Jackson, and Lee, by McHenry Howard, is from the press of Williams and Wilkins Company.

Confederate Wizards of the Saddle: being Reminiscences and Observations of one who rode with Morgan, by Bennett H. Young, is from the press of Chapple Publishing Company.

It is understood that Mr. E. L. Sabin, in the preparation of *Kit Carson Days (1809–1868),* just issued by McClurg, made extensive use of rare sources.

The Preliminary Diplomacy of the Spanish-American War, by Lewis A. Harding of Greensburg, Indiana (Indianapolis, the Hollenbeck Press),

is a pamphlet of 19 pages in which the important events indicated by its title are conveniently presented in compact form with suitable references.

Senate Document No. 719, 62 Cong., now in press, is a compilation of laws, agreements, executive orders, proclamations, etc., relating to the Indian inhabitants of the United States, negotiated and enacted from December 1, 1902 to 1913—virtually a third volume of Kappler's *Indian Laws and Treaties.*

Senate Document No. 522 of the 63d Congress, second session, is a history of the guaranty of bank deposits in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota, 1908–1914, by George H. Shibley.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

History of Hudson, New Hampshire, by G. W. Browne, has been published in Manchester by the Granite State Publishing Company.

In the May serial of the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Proceedings* Mr. Charles Francis Adams describes the diplomatic work of the Confederate commissioner, John Slidell, and the history of British governmental action on the Trent Affair, revising previous conclusions in the light of the copious and varied store of fresh manuscript material recently acquired by him in England. The title of the paper is "A Crisis in Downing Street". In the June serial Professor Justin H. Smith shows with careful judgment and in some detail the hostility of Great Britain toward and during our war with Mexico. A group of interesting letters from the presidents of the United States, from the private collection of Mr. Curtis Guild, is printed, and a considerable body of letters of Elbridge Gerry, mostly of 1813–1814, of small political importance but entertaining with respect to Washington life in the brief period of Gerry's vice-presidency.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have just issued *Nantucket: a History,* by R. A. Douglas-Lithgow.

The April issue of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains a paper by Dr. Carlos E. Godfrey on the Organization of the Provisional Army of the United States in the anticipated War with France, 1798–1800, showing from the Washington and Hamilton collections in the Library of Congress that the provisional army was more than a paper organization. A roster of officers compiled from these sources is appended. The letters of Judge Henry Wynkoop, representative from Pennsylvania in the First Congress, are continued. There are also some letters of Gen. John Armstrong to Thomas Wharton, president of Pennsylvania, 1777, and some excerpts from the master's log of H. M. S. *Eagle,* Lord Howe's flagship, 1776–1777, from the original log in the Public Record Office and edited by William M. Mervine. In the July number of this magazine Horace W. Sellers contributes a biography and the Journal of Charles Willson Peale, artist and soldier of the Revolution attached to the Philadelphia militia.

Selections from the correspondence of Hugh Roberts, of Phliadelphia, with Benjamin Franklin while the latter was in Europe, are printed from the collection presented by the late Charles Morton Smith to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The contents also include articles on Nazareth, Pennsylvania, during the Revolution, 1775–1779, by John W. Jordan, Paintings by Gilbert Stuart not mentioned in Mason's *Life of Stuart,* listed by Mantle Fielding, and Instructions of Queen Anne to Col. Samuel Vetch for the organization of a Colonial Contingent for the Conquest of Canada, 1708, an imprint by William Bradford, 1709. On the side of genealogy, Thomas Allen Glenn contributes some Genealogical Gleanings of the Wilson or Willsons of Ulster, and W. M. Mervine presents an introductory note and the muster-rolls of the Men of Londonderry in 1630 and 1663.

Philadelphia in the Civil War, 1861–1865, by F. H. Taylor, has been privately printed in Philadelphia. The book is illustrated from contemporary prints and photographs and from drawings by the author.

The Pennsylvania Society of the Colonial Dames of America has brought out *Forges and Furnaces in the Province of Pennsylvania.*

In the *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis,* n. s., XI. 1, Dr. Eekhof continues his article on Jacobus Koelman, but his narrative of the Delaware episode contains almost nothing beyond what has already been known through the documents in the *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York.*

In the June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* are published Some Old English Letters, written in the early part of the eighteenth century, which have come down in the Taney family. The genealogical and editorial notes are by McHenry Howard. Other contributions include a letter, from the society's collections, of William E. Bartlett on the Bank Riot of 1835, and a memorial by Oswald Tilghman of Samuel Alexander Harrison, who wrote much on the history of Talbot County and the Eastern shore. The Vestry Proceedings of St. Ann's Parish, Annapolis, and Land Notes, 1634–1655, are continued.

The Tenth Annual Report of the Library Board of the Virginia State Library, 1912–1913, to which is appended the tenth annual report of the state librarian, has appeared. The report contains a summary description of the manuscript materials recently transferred to the library from the auditor's office, a catalogue of which has already appeared (see the April number of the Review, p. 725). The library plans the publication of a list of the Virginia maps in the state library, with titles of the more important published maps of Virginia in the Library of Congress and in some of the departments of the federal government, and also a list of Virginia colonial soldiers.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* prints in its July issue some Revolutionary correspondence of Colonel Josiah Parker of

Isle of Wight County, Virginia. Included in the correspondence is a letter from Thomas Jefferson, October 26, 1780, one from Major-General Steuben, January 13, 1781, two from Thomas Nelson, June 8 and July 27, 1781, and two from Lafayette, July 18 and 27, 1781. In a selection of letters from the society's collection appear the following: a letter (April 29, 1689) from Nicholas Spencer, secretary of state of Virginia, 1679–1689, to the Lords of the Privy Council, an account of the attack on Rhode Island in 1778, communicated by John Banister to the Virginia delegates in Congress, and several other letters of the Revolutionary period and after. A list of references to colleges and schools found in Richmond newspapers, 1786–1820, given in this issue of the *Magazine,* is indicative of the extent of material of this sort pertaining to the history of education in Virginia.

The July number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Magazine* contains a brief discussion of the Whig Party in the South, suggested by Dr. A. C. Cole's book of that title which recently appeared. Other contents, aside from genealogical materials, are continuations of the documentary series, notes from the records of York County, records of Hanover County, and extracts from the diary of Edmund Ruffin. The period covered by the diary is from June, 1864, to June, 1865.

The March–October issue of the *German American Annals* consists of a narrative of Christoph von Graffenried, in French, found by Professor Albert B. Faust in Bern, and presented by him as a better version of Graffenried's story of the founding of Newbern and of his American adventures than either of the two versions which have already been made known, the first (French) by the English translation in the *Colonial Records of North Carolina,* volume I., and the second (German) in a previous volume of the *Annals.*

In connection with his eleventh and twelfth annual reports as director, a notable record of two years' progress, Dr. Dunbar Rowland presents in some ninety pages, with an index, *An Official Guide to the Historical Materials in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History,* in which, in a systematic arrangement, every portion of the remarkable collection of documents he has collected during the ten years of his service is listed in proportionate detail. Such systematic surveys of archives are as welcome as they are rare.

Decisive Episodes in Western History, an address delivered before the Iowa State Historical Society in February by Laenas G. Weld, has been published by the society.

The issue of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* for January and April (double number) is devoted entirely to a series of Burr-Blennerhassett documents. There are twenty-one documents in all, principally depositions and affidavits, the first ten of which are presumed to form a part of the original testi-

mony prepared for the Burr trial at Richmond and transmitted to Ohio for use in the Blennerhassett trial, the remaining eleven being drawn from the papers of John Stites Gano presented to the society by Mrs. Laura Vallette Gano. The documents are well edited by Leslie Henshaw, assistant in history in the University of Cincinnati.

The contents of the July number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* include some extracts from the *American State Papers,* presented by A. J. Morrison, concerning a grant by the Continental Congress of a township in Ohio to Arnold H. Dohrman, sometime agent for the United States at the court of Lisbon; the Ohio Prospectus for the Year 1775, by the same writer; a sketch of Clement L. Vallandigham, by W. H. Van Fossan; the Beginnings of Lutheranism in Ohio, by B. F. Prince; and a sketch of Simon Perkins, brigadier-general in the War of 1812, by W. W. Spooner.

The Department of Indiana History and Archives has been indexing for historical purposes a number of the oldest newspapers in the state, giving special attention to its file of the Vincennes *Sun,* which begins in 1807.

The articles of chief interest in the June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* are: Home Life in Early Indiana, by W. F. Vogel; the Campaign of 1888 in Indiana, by R. C. Buley; and Conscription and Draft in Indiana during the Civil War, by C. E. Canup.

The publication committee of the Illinois Centennial Commission has made arrangements to publish, on occasion of the state's celebration in 1918, a history of Illinois in five volumes, of which Professor Clarence W. Alvord is to be editor-in-chief.

Four volumes of the *Illinois Historical Collections* belonging to the British series and illustrating fully the period of Illinois history from 1763 to 1776, edited by Professors Clarence W. Alvord and Clarence E. Carter, are now in the press. It is expected that two volumes will be ready for distribution in January. Other publications in progress are: a series of volumes containing sources for the early exploration of the Illinois country, edited by Dr. Frank E. Melvin; a volume of political statistics prepared by Dr. Solon J. Buck and Dr. Wayne E. Stevens; several volumes, edited by Professors J. A. James and Charles H. Ambler, made up from the newly found George Rogers Clark material in the Virginia State Library; and a collection of the letters and speeches of Lincoln previous to his inauguration, edited by Professors Daniel K. Dodge and Clarence W. Alvord, who request the co-operation of persons possessing information in regard to unpublished Lincoln material.

The *Annual Report* of the Chicago Historical Society for the year 1913, just issued, includes biographical sketches of deceased members, an account of the society's activities, and lists of accessions of manuscripts

and books. Among the manuscripts acquired are some letter-books and correspondence of William B. Ogden, 1836–1850, a letter-book of Richard J. Hamilton, 1842–1849, minutes of the Chicago Medical Society, etc.

Recent accessions to the Burton Historical Library, Detroit, include the papers of Thomas W. Palmer, formerly United States senator from Michigan.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has published as a memorial to its late superintendent, Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites, a small volume containing a memorial address upon his life and work by Professor Frederick J. Turner, and a bibliography of Dr. Thwaites's writings. It has also issued a new volume of *Proceedings* for 1913 containing a paper on the Spanish Domination of Upper Louisiana, by Judge Walter B. Douglas; one on the Telegraph in Wisconsin, by Ellis B. Usher; one on La Vérendrye's Farthest West, by Doane Robinson; and the Recollections of Antoine Grignon. The society has in press a volume beginning the calendaring of the Draper Collection of manuscripts.

Wisconsin, its Story and Biography, in eight volumes, by E. B. Usher, is put forth by the Lewis Publishing Company.

The *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society for September contains a paper on the late Vice-President Stevenson, an account of MacArthur's raid of 1814, by A. C. Quisenberry, a paper on some early engineers and architects in Kentucky, by Alfred Pirtle, and extracts from certain county records.

The History of Unity Baptist Church, Muhlenberg County, Kentucky, by Otto A. Rothert (Louisville, Press of John P. Morton and Company, 1914, pp. 59), is a modest and very intelligent account of a single church, in which, with many interesting extracts from the record books of the church, the author enables one to understand the meaning and influence of such an organization.

In the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* are two valuable studies by Jacob Van der Zee, French Discovery and Exploration of the Eastern Iowa Country before 1763, and Fur Trade Operations in the Eastern Iowa Country under the Spanish Régime. Other articles in this number of the *Journal* are on the Private Land Claims of the Northwest Territory, by Louis Pelzer, and on the Quakers of Iowa in 1858, by Sarah Lindsey.

In the April number of the *Annals of Iowa* is a tribute to William B. Allison by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, revised and adapted from his memorial address delivered in the United States Senate in February, 1909. Frank M. Mills writes of Early Commercial Travelling in Iowa, and John F. Lacey some Recollections of 1864.

The manuscript division of the Missouri Historical Society has acquired a group of autographs and letters of the Missouri Confederate Generals A. E. Steen, F. M. Cockrell, D. M. Frost, John S. Bowen, M. Jeff Thompson, and Sterling Price (this last mentioned letter, also signed by Ex-Governor Trusten Polk, was addressed to Governor Reynolds and relates to the Missouri general election of August, 1864); a very interesting letter of George Croghan, dated December 21, 1768; and a book of field notes of the west boundary of Missouri, south of the mouth of the Kansas River, made in 1823 by Joseph C. Brown. The library has received an unusual collection of pamphlets relating to the Icarian Colony at St. Louis, and the archaeological department a fine collection of pipes, gathered in every part of the world and comprising several hundred specimens, and a collection of Indian relics, numbering several thousand and representing the entire range of surface finds.

Volume III. of the *Official Report of the Debates and Proceedings in the Nebraska Constitutional Convention assembled in Lincoln, June 13, 1871*, revised and edited by Albert Watkins, has been issued as vol. VIII. (series II.) of the *Publications* of the Nebraska State Historical Society. The volume (676 pages) contains also the journals of the convention of 1875, a history of the attempt to form a state organization in 1860, of the abortive constitutional convention of 1864, of the formation and adoption of the constitution of 1866, and of the origin of the conventions of 1871 and 1875.

The July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains the opening chapters of an extended study, by R. G. Cleland, of the Early Sentiment for the Annexation of California; an Account of the Growth of American Interest in California, 1835–1846; the first half of a careful study, by Anna I. Sandbo, of the Beginnings of the Secession Movement in Texas; and an interesting paper by Miss Elizabeth H. West on Southern Opposition to the Annexation of Texas, casting new light upon the subject.

Vol. IV. of the *Collections* of the State Historical Society of North Dakota is just appearing from the press. Among the papers two documents are of special interest to the history of the lower Red River Valley: a reprint of Judge Coltman's summary of evidence in the famous controversy between the Northwest Company and the Hudson's Bay Company, 1816–1821, and the minutes of council of the latter company, 1833–1841, placed at the disposal of the historical society by their owner, a famous employee of the company. Among the more noteworthy local studies are one on the Hudson's Bay Company and the Red River Fur Trade, and one on the Establishment of our Northern International Boundary Line. There is an excellent history of the Presbyterian church in North Dakota, which furnishes some typical sketches of frontier missionary life, while the history of one of the western counties affords an interesting glimpse of the conflict between ranchers and farmers

in the early days of Dakota Territory. The volume contains also lists of early residents in the census for certain counties in 1885.

Miss Katharine B. Judson's *Subject-Index to the History of the Pacific Northwest and of Alaska* (Olympia, Washington State Library, pp. 341) is an index to official publications of the federal government, from 1789 to 1817. For Alaska, we are to have before long an extraordinarily complete bibliography, prepared at the instance of Judge Wickersham by the competent hands of Mr. Hugh A. Morrison of the Library of Congress.

Mr. C. O. Ermatinger contributes to the July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* a paper concerning the Columbia River under the Hudson's Bay Company, and Professor Edmond S. Meany a discourse upon Three Diplomats prominent in the Oregon Question. The three diplomats were John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, and Albert Gallatin. Professor Meany's paper is the presidential address before the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association in May. The Journal of John Work (September 7 to December 14, 1825), edited by T. C. Elliott, is continued, as is also the new Vancouver journal begun in the April number of the *Quarterly*, and edited by Professor Meany.

The issue of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for December contains the reminiscences of Captain William P. Gray, a resident of Oregon since his birth in 1845, some letters of Burr Osborn giving his reminiscences of the Howison expedition to Oregon in 1846, and the journal of Alexander Ross on the Snake Country Expedition in 1824. For the last mentioned document Mr. T. C. Elliott contributes editorial notes. The other two referred to are contributed by Fred Lockley and George H. Himes, respectively.

The Dominion Archives have in press a *Guide to the Documents in the Manuscript Room at the Public Archives of Canada*, prepared by Mr. David W. Parker.

The Champlain Society has just brought out the first volume of its new edition of Captain John Knox's *Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America, 1757–1760*, edited by the Dominion Archivist, Dr. Arthur G. Doughty. Among the books which the society has in preparation are a series of three volumes upon the War of 1812, by Lt.-Col. William Wood, containing much material hitherto unpublished; a volume relating to the administration of General Murray, to be edited by Mr. Duncan A. McArthur; a volume relating to the administration of Sir Charles Bagot, to be edited by Professor Kylie of Toronto; and a volume on the Clergy Reserves, by Mr. J. P. Lacock.

Volume I. of Mr. Gustavus Myers's *History of Canadian Wealth* (Chicago, Kerr), a companion study to that author's *Great American Fortunes*, deals with the causes of the concentration of wealth in Canada: the fur-trade, the concentration of railroads, and the influence of land and money subsidies granted by the government.

Martinus Nijhoff of the Hague has begun the issue of an *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch West-Indië,* edited by Dr. H. D. Benjamins and Joh. F. Snelleman. The work, which is of a high order, is announced to be completed (in 1915 it was hoped) in from ten to fifteen parts, of which the first has already appeared.

Messrs. Scribner's South American series has been increased by the addition of *Ecuador: its Ancient and Modern History, Topography, and Natural Resources, Industries, and Social Development,* by C. Reginald Enock.

C. A. Villanueva has published an *Historia de la República Argentina* (Paris, Rosas, 1914, pp. 871), and Professor D. Antakoletz has begun the publication of an *Histoire de la Diplomatie Argentine* of which the first volume (Paris, Pedone, 1914) treats the years 1810–1814.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. T. McKenzie, *A New View of Benjamin Franklin* (Century Magazine, July); O. Beuve, *Un Petit-Fils de Montesquieu, Soldat de l'Indépendance Américaine, d'après des Documents inédits* (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, April); M. Serrano y Sanz, *El Brigadier Jaime Wilkinson y sus Tratos con España para la Independencia del Kentucky, Años 1787 a 1797,* I. (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, March); Elihu Root, *The Monroe Doctrine* (North American Review, June); T. S. Woolsey, *The Monroe Doctrine* (*ibid.*); Hiram Bingham, *Latin America and the Monroe Doctrine* (Yale Review, July); W. K. Boyd, *The Finances of the North Carolina Literary Fund,* I. (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); C. F. Adams, *Civil War Literature* [Lord Newton's *Lord Lyons*] (Nation, July 16, 23, 30, August 6); W. L. Hall, *Lincoln's Interview with John B. Baldwin* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); A. S. Tuaner, *La Révolution de Panama, 3 Novembre 1903* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 2); G. Wegener, *Der Panamakanal: seine Geschichte, seine Technische Herstellung, seine künftige Bedeutung* (Volkswirtschaftliche Zeitfragen, XXXVI. 2).

Volume XX] *January, 1915* [*Number 2*

The

American Historical Review

AMERICAN HISTORY AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY[1]

IN every field of modern scientific study there is a body of workers with a certain sense of companionship and a feeling of identity of interests and enthusiasm. Intellectual isolation is almost unknown. New discoveries and contributions to knowledge do not come unheralded from some unknown corner of the thinking world; almost everything—if we know the real scientific processes behind it—we find to be the product of general intellectual movement, in which there has been division of labor, in which there have been leaders and specialists, but also co-operation and intelligent sympathy. History is less thoroughly organized as a field of research than any one of the natural sciences and less than at least one of the social sciences; but the sense of fellowship, the common understanding of aims and ideals, the feeling that we are working together and that ideas are common property, the historical investigators possess in marked degree. No one of us can be very far along in his study of any period without finding that others are beside him or perhaps in accomplishment a parasang in advance. Symmetry and good sense in historical product, showing appreciation of the course followed and the stages reached, are wrought out, not alone by the use of bibliographies and by the application of critique, but by the effect of companionship and the generous interchange of personal opinion.

For this end, this sense of community, the American Historical Association has been consciously and unconsciously working for thirty years. We have the right to congratulate ourselves on results: the spirit of helpfulness and generous appreciation, the knowledge of our individual tastes, capacities, and failings, the fact that book and monograph, as they appear, are the result of combined as well as varied historical study and devotion.

[1] Annual address of the president of the American Historical Association, delivered at Chicago, December 29, 1914.

Some such thoughts as these must come to one called upon for a brief period to preside over this body; and I find myself almost unable to go forward and address my audience without this foreword of appreciation, without for a moment calling the Association to self-consciousness. Probably I am also influenced by the feeling of timidity, which, I imagine, would come to almost any of us endeavoring to speak with some show of assurance to a body of historical scholars, of whose learning and depth of interest he is fully aware. For one must realize, because of the homogeneity I have spoken of, and this interplay of ideas, how difficult it is to be novel, fresh, and illuminating. One can, however, cherish the consolation that if he keeps well within the bounds of the safe and well known, he will at least show he is not far from the life and thought of others.

I propose to discuss the subject of American democracy as a point of view in the writing of American history, and to present my own reactions as to what is central and most fundamental in any wide survey of the last three centuries as we look back upon them. To-day, perhaps more than at any time during our lifetime, we are looking hopefully and fearfully at the whole democratic régime—on the one hand encouraged by a profound belief that a nation, acknowledging the principle that the masses of men should have free opportunity to work out their own destiny, must in the end satisfy the actual needs of men and not the ambitions of privilege; on the other doubting whether mass government, with its heedlessness, wastefulness, incoherence, and absence of foresight, can actually maintain itself, and not only continue to live here in America amid the perplexities and the formidable economic and social trials that beset us, but go on and manifest itself as a conquering world-force. We question with a new foreboding whether in the awful, soul-destroying competition for racial and national aggrandizement, the state which is not led by the trained mind, the scientific expert, the calculating statesman with assured authority, can hold its own and give free scope to the great essential economic and spiritual longings, the blind desires of the multitude, which we have supposed, by the philosophy of democracy, to be the safest and surest impulse for the establishment of human good. We feel called on, as never before, to take stock calmly and going back over our history to estimate the accomplishments and the failings of the American unmethodic system of progress.

But in any such study, not much can be done without recognizing that history has to do with things of the spirit, for fundamentally democracy is a spirit and not merely a form of government. The

historical investigator is ever seeking for facts and events, too well content possibly if he succeeds in finding them and in making some sort of connection with what went before and after. This must on the whole be his daily task; for if we would come to see long lines of tendency and continuing causes and if we wish to watch the interlacing of influences, which appear to flow from varying and different sources, we cannot know the course of the lines without fixing the points, and influences to be known need to be studied in detail and viewed first of all in comparative isolation. But of course history deals with more than events, and with more than the mere outward actions of men; it has to do with ideals and purposes, with the spirit and character of man. And I have sometimes thought in recent days that history was too much afraid of itself, too fearful of anything reaching out into the philosophy of the unseen, as if the unseen were not real. Has history nothing to do with things of the spirit, and has it become materialistic and materializing? Has it no eye for the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things unseen? Has it in and of itself no mission beyond cataloguing? Has it become in itself or will it become an unspirited or dispirited industry? Is not the scientist who writes of the mechanistic conception of life more nearly a ministering spirit than the maker of catalogues of events, more nearly humanistic than the historian who dreads even psychology and fails to reckon with *mores* and folk-ways, lest he venture and be lost in the unpathed wilderness of sociology? The scientist has no fear: the chemist dealing deftly with atoms, the physicist handling unseen force and giving it name and quality, the astronomer looking into infinite space and speaking in terms beyond the finite—they have no fear of philosophy or metaphysics or of all-embracing reality; they would see things face to face. They will not call their faith religious, but they are consciously reaching after the causative, the unifying, the universal, and the eternal. But history is afraid, industrial, materialistic, satisfied with product, keeping accounts, priding itself on its full storehouses.

American history has more to do than to hunt facts or catalogue occurrences. Above all other histories it has the task of feeling character and divining living spirit. For America has been conscious of a purpose and a place and a particular destiny. It may well have had a meaning of which it did not know; but beyond other nations or bodies of men it had, and it thinks it has, a mission. Whatever America may really mean, it has believed that its feet were rightly set on a path leading to human improvement, and, though the mean-

ing of our own life is far beyond our own consciousness, our history must be studied fundamentally with this fact in mind. Even to-day the man on the street has no trouble in finding phrases to express his belief in what we are and should be, and it has always been so; indeed, the newest comer to our shores often seems to know better than does the scholar or the man of big affairs what we are and whither we should go. Below the discontent and the bitterness of social strife is some sense that we are failing to live up to the ideals we still sometimes put into words. And thus in all we write or think of the past, we cannot wisely omit the hopes and enthusiasms which have been animating the nation; we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there have come changes, moods, developments of temperament, and that these manifestations of intangible character and spirit are the things best deserving evaluation. We may well question whether a nation can ever become truly great without intense self-consciousness and self-appreciation, and, however closely the historian may cling to ideals of scientific objectivity, he may well believe that one duty of historical study and writing is to help make a nation conscious of its most real self, by bringing before it its own activity and the evidences of its own psychology.

In the interpretation of American history, and especially I think constitutional history, writers have plainly been influenced by their own environments. And so any historical work you or I may do is likely to be colored, whether or not we intentionally select a particular prism through which to view the past. Bancroft's great epic, with its paean of exultation over escape from bondage, was a very natural expression of the buoyant, self-confident democracy of the Jacksonian era. The great thought which dominated the time was that, from the heroic deeds of the Fathers, came independence from the mother-country, independence and liberty. If to-day Bancroft's attitude toward his subject seems provincial, despite his heroic attempt to review in passing the events of European history, if it seems rhetorical and over subjective, his work will be of lasting import because he was permeated by the atmosphere of his generation and because he grasped or sought to grasp the spirit of America. After Bancroft's earlier volumes were written, there came a period in which the interesting questions were those of union and slavery. While sectionalism prospered or seemed to prosper, there was a fixed determination to maintain union; nationalist and sectionalist alike viewed the Constitution as a solemn arrangement, a fundamental engagement and provision for union—I do not mean *the* Union or unity,

but something more than isolation. To one set of readers, debaters, and writers the union meant creation of a certain national authority; to the others it meant conservation and preservation of local interest; all agreed that its purpose was to harmonize, protect, and make compatible different interests and varying sectional qualities. The great hope of the time was to prevent disintegration. Calhoun, who can hardly be banished from the field of history any more than from the domain of practical politics or metaphysics, came in his desire for union to see the Constitution as an arrangement for protecting local autonomy, almost as a contract between sections.

Through these years before the Civil War and for some time thereafter slavery came forth as the great matter of discussion, and men read constitutional treatises and examined events of the past to see what light they threw on slavery. Only very recently have we broken away from the tendency to see in the debates at Philadelphia a struggle over slavery; the temptation was strong, almost irresistible, to find North and South pitted against each other, and so arrayed because one was free, the other slave. We needed to tell ourselves and others that the line did not run between North and South, but between little states and big, and that there were lines connecting men of similar social and economic interest. Looking at the days after the Constitution was adopted, we were sure to find what we looked for and more than the fact, not economic and social cleavage and interest or other reasons for division into parties or cliques, but sectionalism with slavery lurking in the background only to be seen by the unerring eye of the man who knew that slavery caused the Civil War, and knew that the Civil War was the only determining, all-meaning event in American annals because it freed the black.

Just as at earlier days we read the history of the colonies with our eyes steadily fixed on Bunker Hill and Yorktown, so for some time after the Civil War men read and wrote remembering that there had been a war fixing the political character of the Union. Von Holst's great treatise was written with a steady eye on Secession. Himself a child of 1848, an enthusiast for union and for liberty—the well-ordered, obedient kind of liberty which a German knows how to admire—he never understood Jefferson or Jackson, while Louisiana, Florida, the Bank, and the War with Mexico, were for him chiefly episodes in constitutional construction and slavery, leading up to South Carolina, Jefferson Davis, and Lincoln.

If we select Von Holst for special mention because his work was able and his volumes many, we need also to remember that most of us have done the same and that only in very recent days have we

come to see that the war was not the end but was itself an episode in a long train of events and causation. I mean to present no objection to anyone's seeking to discover the causes of anything susceptible of being explained by the past; the long succession of incidents and changing conditions lying in the years before the Civil War or of any other war, as far as they explain that event, are properly chosen and held up to view; but I am pointing out that we select and interpret with something central and determinate in our minds, and that American history has been written and read, in considerable degree at least, because men wished to explain some things which were of immediate and fresh interest to them and which *now* do not appear final and all-important.

Many of us are even now looking out upon the field of constitutional history as a branch and only a branch of economic history. One can find no fault with the desire to trace the development of economic conditions, or with the wish to see how economic forces have played through political institutions or toyed with constitutions and parties. The story is there for some one to tell, convincingly if he can and truthfully if he is able to see the light. The ever present danger is the old one—the temptation to find in the past the present, not simply conditions out of which the present came, and to find just what we expect to find and not the almost infinite variety of motive and interest and of personal and social character which changed and changed again under new environment and responded to new suggestion. We are in imminent hourly danger of finding in our midst, and working as one of our own pawns, the economic man, that well-known servant of another science, whom we have all been taught to treat with distant and decent respect as the property of a neighbor whose work we admire but would not imitate.

Probably I am myself the creature of a day, illustrating present moods and visions alone, when I suggest that, primarily, constitutional construction, union, slavery, war, conflicting emotions for states' rights or centralized authority, class interest, economic movement, all bear primarily on the problem which America still faces and on the ideal which, consciously held or not through the whole course of our history, will be looked upon as determining America's place in the world. Certainly we have not yet passed out of the position where we are considered and where we consider ourselves as testing an experiment in popular government and in the development of democratic possibilities. In these days, it is true, our institutions are subjected to the pitiless fire of criticism and are no longer held up to the world as in themselves idols demanding incense and worship;

but probably even the unthinking man never seriously held that the institutions were the sole things intrinsically all-important. We fell, however, into that manner of speech and still use it; for but yesterday I read in a thoughtful magazine article the statement and the prophecy that if the church did not survive and give nourishment to our spiritual life, our institutions would surely fall. What indeed would it profit a man if he gain his own soul and lose his institutions? And yet, behind all this manner of speech there has been from the beginning a conviction that forms of government only symbolized and illustrated something deeper and more worth while.

Is it to distort history again to imagine that the historian of the distant future is bound to inquire whether the experiment in self-government, with all the attendant ideals and motives, really worked out to make men bigger, better, stronger, and higher; to inquire what the struggle was, what the difficulties, what the progress and the retrogression, what war, expansion, factories and machinery, constitutions and courts, food and physical environment, the city and the frontier, all working together, meant and how they operated in the development of men; to inquire whether the ideals, peculiarly represented in governmental institutions, were really masterful and worked out into actual improvement? If this be distortion I must make the best of it; for whether the historians of the future have the problem or not, we certainly are to-day interested in what has gone before us, primarily, I believe, with this experiment in self-government in mind, with all that it involves, or with all that we find to be wrapt up in it—social and individual justice, right as God gives us to see the right, and human condition. Secondary to all this must be placed political and sectional conflict and the din of industrial strife. Amid all this tumult, all the play and impact of human energy, did the ideals of self-government hold firm? How were they altered, through what phases did they pass, how did transient moods or changing problems modify them and affect their onward course? If we have such questions in mind, the stress and emphasis on events of the past will be differently laid in any wide and general view of American history. We remember the words of Henry Adams describing America—spiritual America—at the beginning of the last century:

> European travellers who passed through America noticed that everywhere, in the White House at Washington and in log-cabins beyond the Alleghanies, except for a few Federalists, every American, from Jefferson and Gallatin down to the poorest squatter, seemed to nourish an idea that he was doing what he could to overthrow the tyranny which the past had fastened on the human mind.[2]

[2] *History*, I. 175.

Naturally the events of history must be established by research, and often, if not always, established without any reference to present conditions; a period must be studied in order that all the forces working through or in it may be appreciated and that the characteristics of the succeeding period may be known. I make no plea for the rejection of everything that has no conceivable bearing on the development or workings of American self-government. Everything that made America what it is deserves consideration. Before the eyes of all of us, however, rises the figure of the woodsman of a century ago. As he stood looking out upon the still unconquered continent, seeing visions of human progress, determined to break down the tyranny inherited from the past, believing in a wide and noble freedom, he appears to us the very genius of American history; we can never ignore him for there in very truth he stood and thus in very fact he thought. How far have his dreams come true? With face turned toward the future and with mind filled with characteristic American optimism and confidence, he little knew the difficulty of winning bodily liberty and soul freedom for man, little realized that new tyrannies would take the place of older ones and that chains of his own forging would clog his every step.

A hurried review of certain periods and movements in our history will serve to illustrate my meaning. The new interpretation and the new choice of incidents and points of attention in colonial history emphasize the importance of the colonies as portions of the English empire. The study is part of the effort to understand the expansion of England, or it is part of the general world-history of imperial order and organization. Few problems of the present day are of more absorbing interest than just this problem of imperial expansion and control, for it is perplexing the souls of men everywhere; it is perplexing our souls as we think of the Philippines, Cuba, and the dark cloud on our southern boundary. Moreover, even this study of imperial order and practice is of moment for the student of American constitutional history, for out of the practical working system of the English empire came the system of political organization which we call the American federal state; the composite English empire, with practical distribution of powers between governments, was the parent of the composite United States, the first great federalized empire based upon law and not on opportunism. All this is of great importance; and yet the older point of view, if in some respects provincial and inadequate, is vitally sound at heart; for, though colonial history was often written in earlier days as if the colonies were not colonies, it was written with the idea that histor-

ical tradition, habits of mind, and social and political institutions were forming to come down into the later United States. Most of the older history was written as if the end in view was independence and revolution, or union without even reference to the character of the union; but there was some recognition of the fact that what was done in colonial times had a longer and wider meaning than this. However, over-refinement and over-sensitiveness about viewpoints are needless; colonial history will continue to be viewed as the background of our own history, and, as we more and more come to see it aright, we can better understand the origin of the new self-conscious experiment in democracy, to which was attributed the virtues and vices of democratic government, and from which have been continually drawn evidences to demonstrate the folly of trying to be at once honest, orderly, and democratic. We must remember that, if we have in our later days judged ourselves by other standards and lost sense of what we are and mean, Europe has not ceased for one moment in the last hundred and fifty years to watch us—in war, diplomacy, industrial growth, education, and religion—as a democracy.

Anyone resenting and rejecting the avenue of approach which I have suggested, can hardly help being converted temporarily by considering the Revolutionary period which began about the outbreak of the old French war and ended with the Constitution of the United States. This was a time in which institutions, principles, and character were forming. The important thing for us is what men did and above all what they thought, because out of their doing and thinking came much of the America we know. And yet the Revolution is still spoken of as if it were the war; the days from the peace of 1763 to the surrender at Yorktown are still commonly spoken of as if the great and only thing was independence; whereas in reality both the war and independence were incidents and opportunities in the development of American ideals and ideas, in the unfolding of institutions which formulated or partly expressed principles. The problem which confronted England in the middle of the eighteenth century was whether she could maintain and establish on a permanent basis a far-reaching empire; practically, whether she could reconcile general integrity of the empire with local freedom, and whether, holding the whole as a real political thing, she could grant the opportunity for the developing vigor of younger England across the sea. She failed, because, using all the power of legalistic argument gathered from the stores of purely insular experience, she insisted upon the theoretical acknowledgment of

centralization. The whole controversy enabled America to work out through failure and success the principle of federalism, the establishment of the federal state. All this period is of immense interest, then, because there came out of it a type of imperial organization—one of the two or three signal contributions of America and England to the world of statesmen and state-makers. But even federalism was most significant because, through that mode of political organization, it was possible to hold together a great people, prepared, not in little communities, but in continent-wide proportions, to try the experiment of self-government on a scale hitherto unknown in the world. The arguments for American rights during the Revolutionary period are therefore not important solely or chiefly because they supported rebellion or irritated the complacent ministers in London to acts which precipitated war. Their importance lies in the fact that they foreshadowed federal order and the basis of the composite democratic state.

Even more than federal order and imperial organization came out of the contest with Britain, though we still have the events recounted to us as if even argument and political theory were of interest solely because they were used in bringing on the war; as if the thing to be accounted for is the cleavage of the English race, and not the making of America; as if the war was an incident in British imperial history, not an incident and a cause in the development of American life. Thus the philosophy of the Revolution, the world of ideas in which men lived and moved, are by this treatment made subordinate to battle, though battle was but the opportunity to make over ideas into working realities. Men, in fact, used the philosophy of Locke, Vattel, and the soldiers who had gathered around the camp-fires of Cromwell's Ironsides; they used the teachings of Milton and the Puritanic theories of divine command and unchanging right, not that they might fight; they fought that they might use their philosophy, and out of their fighting and thinking came principles and institutions. This is true, even if we confine our attention to the conscious purposes of men; it is all the more true when we remember that the thing of consequence to us is the emergence of constitutions and ideals out of the wreckage of tea boxes and above the noise of strife. If I were called upon to select a single fact or enterprise which more nearly than any other single thing embraced the significance of the American Revolution, I should select—not Saratoga or the French Alliance or even the Declaration of Independence—I should choose the formation of the Massachusetts constitution of 1780, and I should do so because that consti-

tution rested on the fully developed convention, the greatest institution of government which America has produced, the institution which answered, in itself, the problem of how men could make governments of their own free will, the problem which had troubled and perplexed philosophers and reformers from the time when men began to inquire whether man existed for government or government for man. Moreover, below and beyond the convention were active principles of individual right and justice which were fundamentally inherent in the social and life order of the day. We can more nearly understanding the woodsman, that genius of America, if we see how John Adams and Theophilus Parsons struggled with the task of fastening ideas in institutions. To suppose that these ideas are of the dead past, to treat of the idealistic foundations of authority as fit only for scientific study or for a cabinet of historical curios, is to lose the force of the permanent in American history, and to be blind to facts which are at this moment of towering significance amid the travail of the nations.

Anyone studying the Revolution patiently with eyes open for American achievement, with eyes open to what the contest really meant in our history, will be likely to think that the chiefest movement was not casting aside the chastening hand of the mother-country or the cutting of her apron strings. It was the movement that went on within the colony, simultaneously with the conflict of words and arms against Britain, and resulted in a change in the colony itself. For here again the war was an experience affecting character, as experiences are sure to affect character. It was an opportunity for the play of social forces which deeply modified the nature of the state and its people. We know much about the Revolution as a contest with Britain; we do not yet know enough of the Revolution within America. Primarily, then, navigation acts and port bills, battles and alliances, are intrinsically subordinate to the modification and enlargement of American life. Of this, as I have said, we know little enough. What we want to know more about is not the revolution of America but the experiences by which every colony was in part transformed because of the new opportunity for self-expression and for working out the forces within itself.

If we pass on to the early experiences in the decade or two after the adoption of the Constitution we find their meaning—and I venture to say their higher meaning—as experiences bearing upon the history of democratic government. Even the sore perplexity arising from diplomacy and trouble with Indians has its bearing on popular government, because all these trials reacted on authority

and tested the capacity for judgment and self-control; the mere fact that America lived through the first decades and surmounted her troubles is the important thing. But if one, admitting this fact, should put it aside as too obvious for comment, he will not fail to acknowledge that during the first decades, ideas of government and of popular participation in government were taking on new forms or finding institutional expression. He may not fail to admit it, and yet our history has not by any means been written with this fact uppermost in the writer's mind. We have for example often been told that political parties have always been distinguished by differing modes or principles of constitutional construction. Such assertions were made because the writer was dominated by the notion that the great primary question was not democracy, or even property, but union and national organization. I have no doubt that men were in part actuated consciously by certain beliefs and prejudices concerning nationalism and states' rights; but behind all this was something more. Even states' rights rested on more than local pride and prejudice. Constitutional doctrine was only a support or a weapon. Were it not for some of the books I read, I should suppose it quite unnecessary to assert a fact, which appears elementary, that class interests were involved in these early conflicts and that behind them all was the question whether men could and should govern themselves. Even the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions were more than a protest against overweening nationalism or Federalistic interpretation affecting the rights of the states as such, and it gives us new hold on the whole doctrine of the Resolutions, to read them not from the viewpoint of the Nullification of 1832 or the Secession of 1861, but as embodying in a new way the principles upon which the Revolution—not the Civil War—was fought. Jefferson was not first of all, through and through, a states'-rights man, a strict constructionist, a sympathizer with France, an ambitious leader of men; he was a frontiersman or half-frontiersman under whose blows had already fallen in his native state, primogeniture, entail, and the established church, and who in the nineteenth century formed a university to help in breaking the shackles that held the human mind. It appears not altogether needless even now, after the appearance of many histories and sundry biographies, to declare that Jeffersonism treated not as a spirit, but as a mode of constitutional interpretation or as a system of administration, is not Jeffersonism at all.

What shall we say of party organization, the formation of formidable vital institutions? We can and must say that here we have

a formulation of tremendous influence and significance. Only very recently has the party been seen in its true light as an instrument of government, begotten by the necessities and the opportunities in the popular or quasi-popular state. We see it now. We see that the vital thing was not the government but the association of men gathered into bodies with governments of their own, with determination to get possession of the machinery of administration and legislation. We see that what we call the government was a fortress to be seized by a successful army, and that the army embodied the force and the energy; the army was the thing of real life. But it is a striking illustration of our blindness, that, until something over a decade ago, almost nothing had been done to study the party as a governmental institution, and one intimately connected with the psychology of democracy.

Again, what shall we say of parties? Were they means of expressing popular desire or of molding and controlling it? What effect did party have on the developing character of the popular state? Plainly the problem and the tasks of democracy become more complex because of the multiplication of governments and the increasing rigidity of institutions, which were supposed, often falsely, to be responsive to demands of the people. The complicated nature of the whole situation is humorously presented by the formation of the Jeffersonian party: It was a national party formed to protect states' rights, as if the very spirit of nationalism permeating a party was not at war with localism; it was a highly complicated institution bent upon protecting and furthering individualism, as if individualism and institutionalism were not always in conflict and at daggers drawn; it was a democratic party furnished with organization by a leader and subjected to the command of a dynasty, anxious to control government and to advance its own interests, even when sincerely devoted to sentiment and the "cherishment of the people". The whole history of party machinery and of partizanship is a history of one striking aspect of democratic government; caucuses and platforms, conventions and direct primaries, leaders and bosses, all have their meaning in connection with the struggles for the realization of an ideal of self-government, and with the ideal, not always so consciously present, of a simple and just social order. We have commonly studied parties as if the main thing was the doctrine which they professed; we now see that we must study them with the knowledge that principles were often only *impedimenta*, and we wish to know how, in their constitutions, movements, tendencies, or essential character, they advanced or hindered the activities and quali-

ties of a people who would be and who thought they were self-governing and were winning and using opportunity for self-realization. A party therefore, as seen to-day, is an institution which was developed in the modern popular state for carrying opinions into government and putting men into office, and which, in the course of the decades, creating a character and a government of its own, operated in part at least to benumb individual thought, to control as well as gather public opinion and to hamper efforts for self-government. The individual and the mass in an effort to manage public affairs seem to get inextricably entangled in their own machinery and to be always making their own inhibitions by their very efforts to act. To understand the party we need once again to know the American psychology and to appreciate the spirit of an earnest, hurried, bewildered, confident, changing people.

The decades between the Revolution of 1800 and the surrender at Appomattox are of course full of complexity and I have neither the inclination nor the ability to translate the life of the time into definite terms of human effort bearing on the problem of the popular state, the state which started out believing it had a mission and which still thinks it stands for an idea and a principle. But here again things have a new and more real interest for me if I read them in the light of democracy—a changing and developing democracy, it is true, but a democracy believing more than ever before in itself and its destiny —or if I read them with much more in mind than slavery and civil war. The most important fact characteristically omitted or obscured by all but very recent historians was the development of the spirit of democracy, which radically modified our more formal institutions of government; this change in the spirit was of course the change of deepest import.

During a large portion of this so-called middle period of our history, there were various sorts of sectionalism affecting the activity and the character of the nation. We have been well and wisely taught that, especially in the fifty years preceding Lincoln's inauguration, the conflict of forces was by no means altogether between North and South; that all through our history East and West were realities; that American democracy was molded by the frontier and our character shaped by the opportunities of a continent. The rapid peopling of the Mississippi Valley and the general effect of westward expansion have been seen at something like their true value in the last twenty years, for it was only twenty-one years ago that the article on the "Significance of the Frontier" was read to this Association. It is just such grasping of facts in a way to disclose their spiritual

import that appears most desirable in any wide consideration of changing American civilization. We have come to see the general significance of East and West, two regions in the same body politic, one further advanced than the other in social complexity and industrial organization; we have come to see that this sectionalism had its effect on the essential character of America and marked the routes along which democracy moved. So perhaps the sectionalism which distinguished North from South, because they were in different stages or conditions of industrial and social order, may yet be studied as more than explanatory of war and of varying constitutional construction. Moreover we had, in fact, for fifty years, four or five sections—partly self-conscious; and until we know their economic and psychic reactions we cannot know American history.

Until very recent days, slavery and slave-owning were treated without special regard for the significance of the whole problem for us. Until long after the war, the North insisted on discussing slavery almost as an abstraction; the central and dominant thought was that slavery was inhuman and wrong. Well, so it was. I have no desire to underestimate the meaning of the institution or to belittle the contest between slavery and the great wave of humanitarianism which finally washed the curse away and made the black a freeman. One cannot stand unaffected as he traces the growth of a movement which ended in the final overthrow of a system and of ideas which were hoary with age when Moses stood beside the burning bush and heard the call of the Lord summoning him to lift His chosen people from bondage. And yet I think I am right in saying that we are now come to the point where we look upon the disappearance of American slavery as an incident in the general history of relationship between races, as part of the history of the problem which more than any other is troubling and arousing men the world over—seemingly the greatest single problem we know to-day if we look out over the world and include in our view Australia, South Africa, the Balkans, Russia, the United States, and India. But, though all this be true, though slavery as we see it in American history has its place in this wider field of world conditions, we are forced to see it here as it affected the growth and helped to form the character of the popular state. We may study, if we will, how American conditions affected race relationships; but as students of American history we are chiefly intent upon knowing how race relationships affected America. And as we study the whole matter, we see that slave-owning had a meaning not less important than slavery; certainly not less significant than the subjection of the blacks was the nature, purpose, and quality, inherent

in the developing character of the industry and its management; for slave-owning was a form of capitalism, and in its later phases a form of "big business", the first form or one of the first forms which, with determination, reached out to make policies and to control governments for its own advancement; it was an economic interest seeking to subordinate political authority and national ideals to its own ends.

The Civil War, though caused by slavery, involved more than union or disunion, free labor or slave; it meant more than a clash between theories of constitutional construction. During the days of actual conflict it had a deeper meaning to far-seeing men here and to men across the water ready to look upon all we did or thought as incidents in the life of a state which had held up to the world the idea of free government. The aristocrat in England instinctively sympathized with the South, not because he favored the crude primitive form of slavery in which the master owned the body of the toiler, nor because he disbelieved in the maxims or emotions of humanitarianism, nor yet because he cherished the "sacred right of revolution". The life and fortunes of a mighty democratic state were in the balance; discord and dismay, appearing to foretell the breakdown of the great republic, fortified and justified aristocratic distrust of popular government. Lincoln too was not misled; thus too he saw the conflict: "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived or so dedicated can long endure." He had in mind of course the ideals of the nation, not the relationship between races; for no one knew better than he did that, four score and seven years before, men had not been dedicated to the extirpation of negro slavery. Such thoughts as these I hesitate to give utterance to, if they seem to reflect upon the sentiment of a section which was buoyed up by a certain nobility of motive and by a loftiness of purpose, and which still cherishes, and rightly cherishes, the memories of a struggle in which men died for what they believed right. The thing farthest from my mind is to throw obloquy on a section by any imputation of low motives. We have, I hope, passed by all that. The historian can hardly pass over the war, however, as if it meant nothing but the victory of a nationalistic interpretation of the Constitution or the freeing of the black men. Lincoln and aristocratic England could not have been wholly wrong when they considered the war a crisis in the experiment of democratic self-government.

Whether you agree with me in what I have just said or do not agree, you will, I think, be ready to look upon the Civil War as only one of the wars of aggregation and integration in the nineteenth century. The historian, writing of the world movements of the nineteenth century, must include our war as one of the wars making for national integrity and solidarity. Our great struggle meant the establishment of a united single and simplified nation, through which and in which the forces of modern industry and social order found new opportunity for development and strife. The very simplification, amplification, and unification resulting from the conflict, established conditions for later activity in every field of effort or of unconscious movement. Irrespective of motives, causes, and antecedent conditions, the war was itself causative. The war of aggregation rested on united effort and involved development, not only of governmental power, but of social and psychological concentration. The nation came out of it, despite loss and some demoralization, prepared for big unified undertakings. The foundation and progress of nation-wide commercial enterprises were, in part, the product of this vast effort to realize unity and to put forth force in the preservation of union. If men are what they do, if every man is the creature of his own works, then the northern army and the multitude behind it, with minds combined and centred on one common object, were day by day creating capacity for big things in the field of industry—big things which for a time at least overshadowed government, changed conditions of society and appeared to be ushering in a new feudalism which belied and belittled any ideals of equality, individualism, or democracy. It is a mere, well-recognized, truism to say that in Europe the struggle for national statehood created the social basis for a new intellectual and social order, and that, on the other hand, the changing order helped to bring on the struggle. Who would dare, for example, to speak of modern Germany with any show of intelligence, if he had no sense of the psychological effect of achieved nationalism? But in America we have not yet come to a full realization of the tremendous effect of a conflict for integral existence.

But even if the war had no such effect on the social psychology of the nation, this, beyond peradventure, is true: the twenty years after the war were taken up with discussion and argument about it, and men were but dimly conscious that the times loudly called for attention to much besides the things that had embittered their souls. Those twenty years, eventful almost beyond measure, full of movements which were of stupendous import in the life of America, were

studied but yesterday as if they were merely years that came after the war, years of political reconstruction, and not years of overmastering construction, the beginnings of modern industrial America, the America which is trying and testing anew the ambitions and principles of popular government and of social appreciation. We must in fact go back into the war for the beginning of the period, and there we find the act granting land for the western railroads looming up out of the mass of events which covered and obscured it; and in this we see something only less significant—if less dramatic and conclusive—than Vicksburg or Gettysburg. To us to-day, therefore, the war seems almost as important for the reason that men groped about in the mist and dust for a generation afterward, unmindful of what was going on about them and losing the spiritual significance of their own acts, as for the reason that the war had wrought the disappearance of slavery and the establishment of union. We have now begun to talk of industrial development, of the rise of gigantic industry, of factories and railroads and money, of the rise of all those problems which began with the Industrial Revolution but did not seriously begin with us till after the Civil War and which we have known fully and seen face to face for only a decade or two.

No man, I suppose, is thoroughly acquainted with what he is; his memory helps him to know himself. A nation is fortunate if it has even memory—which is history; yet society appears to recognize itself in a condition of existence only when it has already passed, or is just passing into a new stage. We need not speak, therefore, even of the present, with any assurance of knowledge; for, though we think we know what we are and whence we came, we are presumably opening for the future unexpected avenues of progress and throwing up obstacles now unseen. Certain it is that in the decades after the Civil War, we thought we were a nation which had overcome discord, had set up national unity, and was living in unified and secured power. In reality we were a people falling or fallen under the spell of a changing social order, destroying the frontier and the wilderness which had made us what we were and which we hardly knew till they were gone, entering upon phases of industrialism fraught with new perils, fastening chains upon ourselves by the corporate organization of parties, becoming victims of our own prosperity and increasing wealth, admitting in increasing number to our borders and trying to assimilate myriads of humans, whose race capacities and traditions were bound to complicate the problems of social and political movement and to modify the psychology of a nation hitherto comparatively uniform in ethnic composition.

The Fourteenth Amendment is looked on as a product of the war; it is classed by us as a part of so-called Reconstruction; in truth it is a document of immense importance in the history of the years which were filled with problems of industrial and social order unaffected by the old problems of suffrage and sectional difference. With a striking contradiction, it called in national unified power to protect individual right under government; based on individualistic thought, it was and is significant because, on and around it, gathered a mass of technical judicial decisions and a great horde of principles concerning police power, to all intents and purposes a new branch of public law. The lawyer has long ago forgotten that the amendment had anything to do with rebuilding a union of states, with war and disunion, or with blacks and ballots. To him it is an opportunity to test the validity of state legislation affecting corporate interests based on the principles of individualistic law. Nothing better than this illustrates how full of pitfalls and hazards is the course of democracy and how supremely difficult is the task of self-government. Just at the moment when society was moving away most markedly from conditions of individualism and entering upon a fuller recognition of itself, just when forces were assiduously at work creating new social claims and duties, just when there was coming to life a series of social forces which appeared to be individualizing society and socializing the individual, an amendment, founded on thinking which was already in part outgrown, was added to the organic law and was soon appealed to, not so much to protect the individual, as to shield the corporation which is an individual only in the eyes of the law.

We have, as I have already said, learned in considerable measure the spiritual significance of the frontier and the meaning of nature in the growth of America. Now that the frontier is gone, we see that, while the task of conquering the continent developed American character and quickened capacity, it did something more than establish individual self-reliance. If at one time nature, the wide prairies and the free forest, seemed to offer permanent assurance of individual right and the reality of individual freedom, they in fact furnished too the foundations for great fortunes and for gigantic undertakings eclipsing in their magnificence anything the world had ever known before. Thus again appear perplexing contradictions, conflicts between activities and actual results—nature stimulating individualism and creating masterful organization. If free government and democracy be shipwrecked in the conflict between classes, the historian of the future, looking back on American history, will see

the New World with one hand holding out opportunity and prompting men to independent thought and action, with the other lavishly offering room for colossal undertakings to be carried out only by combination and system; he will see the individual man using the resources of a virgin continent and storing up vast wealth, which constantly recreated and enlarged itself, until he was caught and held captive by the results of his own toil and submerged by his own product, and until inequality of industrial opportunity involved loss of political and social equality as well. He will also see, I fear, the decades of waste and destruction, affecting, deeply affecting the national spirit and capacity and interfering with what beyond peradventure must show itself if democracy survive—I mean economic efficiency in all forms of political activity. If democracy cannot husband resources, save life, accomplish much with little, give justice without prodigal expenditure of energy, unrelenting nature is fighting against ultimate realization of success. Beneath all the superstructure of even spiritual achievement for the masses of men rests economy—economy of physical and intellectual effort to secure justice and freedom for the spirit. Much that we do to-day at enormous expenditure of thought and social sympathy would not need to be done at all, if democracy were saving and *self*-respecting, looking out for its own needs, thoughtful, foreseeing, *self*-governing.

In speaking of American democracy I have thus far made no attempt to analyze the ideal or the fact into its elements, though in reality it is a composite. Behind all the variety and conflict, however, has rested the belief that men should have a chance and not be sifted or sorted on any artificial or traditional theory of worth; mass government has been thought desirable because it has been thought to make secure a sound and thoroughly natural basis of evaluation. Because we still harbor this sentimental belief, we look with foreboding on stratification and classification, which will either benumb personal effort or, by setting up group barriers, prevent free play of common sentiments and motives; for the groundwork of democratic equality is the common possession of human ideals.

We still talk in terms of old-time politics, and the terms may well be used if they carry with them recognition of new realities; and so I may use the term "new nationalism"; but I do not mean any theory of relationship between governments or any doctrine of unchecked constitutional construction—those things even now are of the past; for in reality what is a nation? No definition borrowed from ethnology or political science serves to answer the question, for nationality rests on more than blood or physiognomy or shapes of skulls;

there is no cephalic index of the spirit. A nation implies more than subjection to a government or than inclusion within geographical limits; it means, as Mazzini declared, a body of people united in a common duty toward the world; it involves, if it be real, the possession, the all-absorbing and the common possession, of ideals and beliefs. If the free state is, as Thiers once said, a moral being which thinks before it acts, the fully self-conscious nation is one permeated by certain hopes and purposes upon which it lives and to which it devotes its life. You cannot have a nation without a common property in things of the mind and the soul.

The new or the renewed nationalism, therefore, does not consist in breaking down state authority or overcoming geographic provincialism; it must have for its purpose the bigger American task of unifying society on principles of common idealism. We need to leave behind us the older terms, if freighted with their older meanings. Just as we had industrial nationality before we were aware of it and while we still spoke in legal phrases or in the words of political science, with our eyes fixed on a political system, on the relationship between geographic sections, and on classified governments, so we may have a denationalized society, while we cling blindly to our old phraseology and fill our minds with older needs. While we recognize that industry is no longer local and that, in government, sectional interests have been subjected to general control, we may be harboring spiritual and intellectual provincialism, a condition in which men and women in the same locality are divided into classes by impervious walls which belie real nationalism and already betoken disintegration. The old sectionalism was geographic; men were separated by state lines or by physiographic influences. The new sectionalism has itself continental dimensions; it sees no surveyor's lines or natural boundaries; in a way, though chiefly caused by industry, it is not even materialistic. The lines of the old nationalism ran outward through the people from one end of the land to the other; the newest must run from the top downward and from the bottom upward; it must make for real unity and human homogeneity. The old sectionalism was based on misunderstanding, on the failure of each section to understand the other; common understanding is as inconsistent with separateness as integration is with disintegration. The new sectionalism likewise rests on intellectual and spiritual misunderstanding; it exists because there is defective community of sentiment; and, if the nation is to be a nation, ideas must play freely up and down, through and through; without this interplay we may as well cast all our old words into the scrap heap;

for a community without the possession of a common domain is not a community at all.

In these last words, I am not pleading for socialism, for communism in physical properties, for anarchy, or for anything save nationalism in a real spiritual sense. Indeed, as a laborer in the field of history, I ought not, I suppose, to be pleading for anything; but I feel free to suppose that, as citizens as well as historians, we are interested in the vicissitudes of democracy and all its connotations, and one cannot help saying that for us now, the old-time squatter in the wilderness, that genius of American democracy, filled with his hopes and his purposes, looms larger than ever before, and we question with renewed interest how he fared in the decades gone by and how he changed as the wilderness gave place to farm, factory, and school, and as the social order about him lost its primitive simplicity and immediateness. The history of a popular state must be no other, at its inmost heart, than the story of the attempt to become and to remain a popular state.

ANDREW C. MCLAUGHLIN.

THE GOVERNMENT OF NORMANDY UNDER HENRY II.

II.

After 1164 the point of view of our study must be somewhat shifted. Thanks to a series of legislative monuments and treatises which have no Norman analogues, we can trace with some confidence the course of English constitutional development, while our knowledge of Norman affairs is too scanty to permit following the evolution of institutions or policies. The most that we can attempt is to reconstruct the chief elements of judicial and fiscal organization and procedure, in the hope of furnishing an instructive parallel to better known English conditions.

The turning-point in the constitutional history of Normandy during the latter part of Henry's reign is the year 1176, when the death of the seneschal and justiciar, William de Courcy,[1] led the king to appoint in his place as ruler of Normandy Richard of Ilchester, bishop of Winchester, long a trusted officer of the English Exchequer, where he had charge of a special roll and proved himself particularly "alert and businesslike in reckonings and the writing of rolls and writs".[2] Very possibly the constitutional development of Normandy may have lagged behind that of England in the busy years which intervened between the Constitutions of Clarendon and the Assize of Northampton; very likely its administration had fallen into disorder after the rebellion of 1173; certain it is that Richard was excellently qualified by talent and experience to undertake the reorganization of governmental business which seems to have been effected during the year and a half which he now spent in Normandy.

1 On whom see Delisle, *Recueil des Actes de Henri II. Roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie concernant les Provinces Françaises et les Affaires de France, Introduction,* pp. 476–478.

2 *Dialogus,* I. 5 (Oxford ed., p. 77). On Richard see Miss Norgate, in *Dictionary of National Biography,* XLVIII. 194; Delisle, 431–434; Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century,* pp. 116 ff. It is not quite true, as Miss Norgate says, that we have no trace of his activity during his sojourn in Normandy. He is mentioned in three documents: a charter of Philippa Rosel given at the Exchequer in 1176 (original in British Museum, Add. Ch. 15278; Round, no. 517); an assize which he held at Caen in January, 1177 (*Livre Noir de Bayeux,* no. 95; Delisle, p. 347); and an assize held at Montfort "quo tempore Richardus Wintoniensis episcopus in Normannia post regem erat iudex et maior iustitia" (Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie et sa Cour,* p. 272). A tallage levied by him is still carried on the roll of 1180 (Stapleton, *Magni Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae sub Regibus Angliae,* I. 74).

It is not without significance that the roll of 1176 remained the basis of reckoning for more than twenty years, and that from this year we begin to follow with some clearness and continuity the judicial work of the Norman Exchequer.

It has indeed been maintained that the term exchequer does not previously occur in Normandy, and hence that Richard is the creator of the institution.[3] The author of the *Dialogus,* however, who began his treatise while Richard was in Normandy, refers to the Norman Exchequer as an ancient institution, as old perhaps as the Conqueror,[4] under whom we can trace the regular accounting for the ferm of the *vicomtés* which is the essence of such a fiscal system;[5] and the name *scaccarium* occurs in 1171[6] and in a notice of Henry I.'s reign discovered by Round.[7] At what epoch there was introduced the distinctive method of reckoning which gave the Exchequer its name, is an even darker problem in Normandy than in England. According to an ingenious conjecture of Poole,[8] the employment of the abacus for balancing the royal accounts came to England from the schools of Laon in the reign of Henry I. To me the epoch of its introduction seems probably earlier and connected with the abacists of Lorraine in the preceding century;[9] but in any case the Eng-

[3] Valin, pp. 116–136. On Valin's own showing we can hardly imagine Richard creating the Exchequer between his arrival toward Michaelmas of 1176 and the regular session of that body, doubtless also at Michaelmas, mentioned in the Rosel charter of that year (see the preceding note).

[4] I. 4 (Oxford ed.), p. 66.

[5] American Historical Review, XIV. 464–468 (1909); *English Historical Review,* XXIV. 223 (1909), XXVI. 328 (1911) (a *terra data* under the Conqueror). For accounts which run far back of 1176 see Stapleton, I. 12, 92, 94. On the administrative organization as the essence of the Exchequer *cf.* Liebermann, *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* XXVIII. 153 (1913).

[6] Delisle, p. 345; *cf. Eng. Hist. Rev.,* XXVI. 326–328 (1911). No reliance can be placed on the early mention of the Exchequer in a highly suspicious document for St. Evroul, Round, nos. 638, 639; Delisle, p. 316. There is an important document from the Exchequer, 1178–1180 (Round, no. 1123), which Valin overlooks. His misreading of "rotulis trium annorum" (p. 135) as a single roll hardly requires comment.

[7] *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* XIV. 426 (1899). Valin labors hard to explain away this document, which upsets his whole theory of the origin and functions of the Exchequer, on the ground that it was drawn up, probably later, by a canon of Merton who introduced English terminology. Taken apart from any preconceived theory, however, it is strictly parallel to the other notices concerning the lands of Bernard the Scribe, all of which are plainly contemporary records of transactions of the reign of Henry I. and show no trace of tampering. The document is accepted by Poole and Powicke. For a parallel form of 1199 see the facsimile in *Mémoires des Antiquaires,* XV.

[8] Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century,* pp. 42–59.

[9] See my article on "The Abacus and the King's Curia", *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* XXVII. 101–106 (1912). Norman clerks also were in relations with the schools of Lorraine, Ordericus, III. 265.

lish evidence antedates the Norman, and the process may very well be, as Poole urges, "from England to Normandy, not from Normandy to England".

The absence of earlier rolls deprives us of all basis for fixing the nature of Bishop Richard's reforms, which probably had less to do with the mechanism of administration than with the re-establishment of order in the finances through the collection of back accounts—arrearages of seven, fifteen, even twenty years meet us in the roll of 1180[10]—the revision of the farms, and the change of officials which is recorded in 1177.[11] Whatever Richard accomplished, he did not make the Norman Exchequer a copy of the English, for in 1178–1179 the *Dialogue* tells us that the two bodies differed "in many points and wellnigh in the most important".[12]

What these great differences were, apart from the absence of blank farm in Normandy, it is impossible to say, for we have no Norman *Dialogue*. The terms of the Norman Exchequer are the same as the English, Easter and Michaelmas; the officers are likewise called barons; the place is fixed at Caen, where the principal treasury was.[13] One point of divergence which appears from the rolls is that in Normandy each section begins with a statement of the total amount due, whereas in the Pipe Rolls, until 8 Richard I., this can only be discovered by computation.[14] Variation in nomenclature is also seen in the Norman heading *misericordie, promissiones et fines,* corresponding to the *placita, conventiones,* and *oblata* of the English record. In general, however, the two sets of rolls rest upon the same fundamental system of accounting,[15] the greater detail and subdivision of the Norman roll resulting from the existence of a set of local areas much more complex and irregular than

[10] Stapleton, I. 12, 92, 94.

[11] Benedict of Peterborough, I. 198. The words of Ralph de Diceto (I. 424) "fiscalia diligenter recensens" need mean no more than is here suggested. On these points I am glad to find myself in agreement with Professor Powicke (pp 73–75, 85).

[12] I. 4 (p. 66).

[13] That the principal treasury was at Caen as early as 1172 is clear from Robert of Torigni's account (II. 297) of the deposit there of the barons' returns of that year. See also Stapleton, I. 56, and another mention on page 110, where the treasury at Rouen is likewise important. Treasure was also kept at Falaise (*ibid.*, I. 39), which had been the principal place of deposit under Henry I. (Robert of Torigni, I. 200; Ordericus, V. 50), and at Argentan (Delisle, p. 334). On the use of castles for the custody of treasure see Round's introduction to the *Pipe Roll of 28 Henry II.*, p. xxiv.

[14] Stapleton, I. xi; Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century*, p. 130.

[15] Powicke, p. 74, notes as an example the parallel distinction "between these fines and amercements for which the bailiff is responsible personally, and those for which the persons concerned are responsible".

the English shires. The older *vicomté* and *prévôté* persist in spite of the superposition of the newer *bailliage*;[16] many of the tithes and fixed allowances go back to the Conqueror's time or even earlier,[17] and the ferm, less affected by *terre date* than in England, seems to have undergone little change except in the case of important commercial centres like Rouen, Caen, and Dieppe.[18] The whole substructure of ducal finance was evidently very ancient, and for that reason in Henry's time quite inadequate, and the rolls show clearly that, as in England, the chief means for supplementing it were found in the administration of civil and criminal justice. However interesting it might be to follow out in detail the points of agreement and divergence in the methods of the two Exchequers, the fact of primary importance is that, so far as northern Europe is concerned, England and Normandy stand in a group by themselves, well in advance of all their neighbors in the development of a money economy and in the mechanism of fiscal administration.

As regards its functions as a court, it has recently been argued[19] that the Exchequer of the Norman dukes was in no sense a judicial body and was in no wise connected with the later Échiquier de Normandie. This view is a natural reaction against those writers who approached the earlier institution with the ideas of an age when the Exchequer was known only as a court, but it assumes a breach in that continuity of law and institutions which is in general so noteworthy in passing from Angevin to Capetian Normandy, and it does not fully realize the fluidity of the Anglo-Norman *curia*.[20] What we seem rather to find is a *curia* which sits for fiscal purposes at Caen and for judicial purposes at various places in the duchy, and which, when Philip Augustus transfers its fiscal duties to Paris, retains its judicial functions and its Anglo-Norman name. The chief thing to avoid in tracing its history is the projection back into the Anglo-Norman period of the more fully organized Échiquier which we know from the *Grand Coutumier* and the *arrêts* of the thirteenth century. From the reigns of Henry II. and Richard a small but definite body of cases furnishes conclusive evidence of the activity of the Exchequer in judicial matters, and indicates that there was no

[16] On the whole subject of local geography, see Powicke, pp. 61–79, 103–119.

[17] American Historical Review, XIV. 465–467; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 223 (1909).

[18] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 222–224 (1909); Stapleton, I. 56, 68, 70.

[19] Valin, pp. 137–139, 249–251, the two passages are not wholly consistent. See, *contra*, Powicke, *Loss of Normandy*, pp. 85, 398.

[20] On the fundamental identity of *curia*, Exchequer, and assizes, see Fréville, "Étude sur l'Organisation Judiciaire en Normandie aux XII^e^ et XIII^e^ Siècles", *Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit*, 1912, p. 683.

clear distinction between its competence and that of the *curia regis*.[21] As in England in the same period,[22] it seems probable that the difference was essentially one of place: when the *curia* sat in the Exchequer chamber at Caen, it was said to sit at the Exchequer, when it sat elsewhere it was called simply the *curia*. Certainly the distinction was not, at least among the higher officers, one of personnel, for the same men appear at one time as barons, or justices,[23] of the Exchequer and at another as justices holding assizes in various parts of Normandy.[24] In the sessions of the Exchequer the seneschal naturally presided, accompanied by certain men who bear the title of barons or justices, but in the documents are not always distinguishable from the other barons and clerks in attendance. In a charter of 1178–1180,[25] besides William Fitz Ralph the seneschal, we find as barons, William de Hummet, the constable, Master Walter of Coutances, who had served as clerk of the king's *camera* and keeper of the seal, and was perhaps treasurer of Normandy,[26] Osbert de la

21 For cases and transactions before the Exchequer in this period see *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198–201; Delisle, p. 349; Valin, pièces, nos. 19, 24, 25, 28; Round, nos. 309, 310, 438, 461, 485 (another version in MS. Lat. 10086, f. 109v), 509 (also in the British Museum, Add. Ch. 15289, no. 2), 517 (original in Add. Ch. 15278; some additional witnesses in the confirmation in Archives of the Calvados, H. 322, no. 3), 560, 606 (where the witnesses are omitted; original in Archives of the Calvados, H. 6607, 301–303), 608, 1123; cartulary of Fécamp, f. 25 (letter of Archbishop of Rouen to William Fitz Ralph and the other barons of the Exchequer notifying them of the settlement of a question of presentation in the court of the Bishop of Bayeux); Cartulaire de Normandie, f. 68v (*infra*, note 23); Archives of the Calvados, H. 5716, 6607 (78–83, 309), 6653 (338–342), 6672 (293–301), 6679 (186–191), 7707; Archives of the Orne, H. 3916 (*infra*, note 28); and the following passage in Richard's great confirmation of the privileges of St. Stephen's: "Recuperavit idem [abbas Willelmus, d. 1179] super Robertum de Veim in curia H. regis patris nostri apud Cadomum hereditagium quod idem Robertus clamabat in tenendo manerio de Veim et de Sancto Leonardo, et super Robertum de Briecuria ecclesiam Sancti Andree de Vilers de qua monachos violenter dissaisierat sed iuditio baronum qui erant ad scacarium apud Cadomum adiudicata est ecclesia predicta Sancto Stephano et restituta". Archives of the Calvados, H. 1836; *cf.* Deville, *Analyse*, p. 52. Most of these documents relate to agreements or acknowledgments before the Exchequer, but good examples of judicial proceedings will be found in the last extract; in Valin, nos. 24, 25, 28; in Round, nos. 309, 310, 438; and in the documents given in facsimile in *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV.

22 Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century*, pp. 174–182; *cf.* Adams, in American Historical Review, XVIII. 357 (1913).

23 "Hoc autem factum fuit apud Cadomum ad scaccarium coram iusticiis domini regis tempore Willelmi filii Radulfi senescalli Normannie". Cartulaire de Normandie, f. 68v. So also in Valin, nos. 19, 24; Round, nos. 438, 509, 517, 1123.

24 See the list of assizes, *infra*, appendix.

25 *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XXX. 672 (*cf.* XIX. 66); Round, no. 1123.

26 Delisle, pp. 106–113. The title "thesaurarius Rothomagensis" (Delisle, p. 101; Round, no. 34) probably means treasurer of the cathedral rather than

Heuse, constable of Cherbourg, Ranulf de Grandval, Richard Giffard, and Gilbert Pipart, justiciars of the king, the last two having served as justices in England and as barons of the Norman Exchequer under Richard of Winchester.[27] Later we find most frequently Haimo the butler, the justices William de Mara and Richard Silvain, Jordan de Landa, and certain clerks, of whom as many as four appear in one charter of the period.[28] Most of these clerks are only names to us, but we can follow with some clearness two members of the clerical family of Arri, Roger, canon of Bayeux since the early years of Henry's reign and a regular witness in records of the *curia* and Exchequer from 1164 to 1191,[29] and Anquetil, who attests less frequently but receives a livery as clerk of the Exchequer as late as 1198;[30] while another type appears in William Calix, a constant witness from the time of Richard of Ilchester, a responsible disbursing officer in the roll of 1184, and a large money-lender on his own account, forfeiting to the crown at his death a mass of chattels and pledges[31] which suggests on a smaller scale the operations of that arch-usurer William Cade.[32] The rolls show other ecclesiastics active in the business of the Exchequer, notably the king's chancellor, Ralph of Wanneville, later bishop of Lisieux and treasurer of Normandy;[33] but until Henry's faithful clerks are rewarded with the sees of

royal treasurer at Rouen; but Ralph of Wanneville, treasurer of Rouen, was also treasurer of Normandy (Round, no. 21; Stapleton, I. 110), and we know that the office of ducal treasurer had been combined with a canonry in the cathedral from the time of Henry I. (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 224–226, 1909). There are relations between the duke and the treasurer of Avranches (Delisle, p. 346) and Bayeux (American Historical Review, XIV. 471, 1909; *Livre Noir*, nos. 13, 138, 271, 275) which may have had some significance. For the conversion of the plate of Rouen cathedral to the uses of Henry II. see MS. Rouen 1405, f. 18 (Round, no. 274).

[27] Delisle, pp. 376, 428.

[28] Grant of Willelmus de Mool to the nuns of Almenesches, Archives of the Orne, H. 3916: "Actum est hoc apud Cadomum ad scacarium coram Willelmo filio Radulfi tunc Normannie senescallo, testibus his: Anschetillo de Arre, Radulfo de Lexoviis, Daniele, magistro Gaufredo de Cortone clericis de scacario, R. abbate Sancti Andree de Gofer, Ricardo Hartie, Turofredo de Cyerni, Willelmo filio comitis Johannis, Henrico de Mool, Radulfo de Rupetra, Ricardo de Argenciis, Radulfo Martel, et aliis pluribus".

[29] Part I., note 62; *Livre Noir*, nos. 45, 73, 128, 129, 135, 139, 182, 442; Round, nos. 432, 435, 437, 438, 456, 461, 485, 509, 1446, 1447, 1451; the Exchequer notices cited in note 21; and the list of assizes below, p. 289.

[30] Stapleton, I. 145, 225, II. 376, 384; and the lists just cited.

[31] Round, no. 517; Stapleton, I. cli, 110, 129, 130, 145, 170, 171, 183, 194–198, 226, 228, 240, II. 375, 379 (the Countess of Richmond as a debtor), 465–469; and the lists.

[32] On whom see *English Historical Review*, XXVIII. 209–227, 522–527, 730–732 (1913).

[33] Delisle, pp. 99–103.

Évreux, Lisieux, and Rouen toward the close of the reign, the higher clergy are less prominent in the administration than they were in his earlier years.

Of those who serve the king in Normandy many have served or will serve him elsewhere; his officers and treasure are passing to and fro across the Channel; his household is ever on the march, and some elements in it are common to the whole Plantagenet empire; yet Normandy has also officers of its own. Some are clerks, such as the treasurer,[34] the subordinates in the Exchequer,[35] and the chaplains of the great castles;[36] some are serjeants, acting as ushers,[37] money-changers,[38] writers,[39] marshals,[40] pantlers,[41] and larderers;[42] and for local government there are the keepers of jails, parks, and forests[43] and fairs,[44] as well as the *vicomtes, prévôts, baillis,* and constables upon whom the whole system rested—in all a multitude of officials, compared by Peter of Blois to an army of locusts,[45] with the bureaucratic element rapidly gaining on the feudal in a way which anticipates the *gens du roi* of the thirteenth century.

Throughout the administration of justice the seneschal is the all-important figure. Something of his enhanced importance was doubtless due to the absences of Henry and Richard and the decline of the personal justice of the sovereign, but something must also

[34] The relation of the treasurer to the chamberlain on the one hand and to the custody of local treasure on the other is not perfectly clear. In the rolls of 1180 and following the Norman treasurer has an assured income unconnected with service in the king's household and consisting of the tithes of the *vicomtés* of Fécamp, Caux, Auge, Lieuvin, Roumois, and the country between Risle and Seine, and of the great forests of the Seine valley. Certain of these can be found in the possession of Henry I.'s treasurer, and their antiquity and situation may point to an even earlier origin. See *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIV. 224 f. (1909). The duke's chaplain at Bayeux similarly had the tithe of the regards of the forest of Vernai (Stapleton, I. 5). Can this have some connection with a local treasury (*supra*, note 26)?

[35] *Supra*, notes 28–31; and *cf.* the clerks who appear in the roll of 1180, pp. 37, 56–58.

[36] Stapleton, I. 5, 7, 90; *Rotuli Normannie*, pp. 7, 23; *Rotuli Cartarum*, pp. 69, 107.

[37] Valin, p. 151, note 3; *Rotuli Cartarum*, p. 82; Eyton, *Court, Household, and Itinerary of Henry II.*, p. 9.

[38] Delisle, nos. 199, 381, 527; Stapleton, I. 77; "Symon cambitor tunc prepositus Andeleii" in cartulary of Mortemer (MS. Lat. 18369), f. 103 (1168).

[39] Hereditary *scriptor prepositure Cadomi* in *Olim* (ed. Beugnot), I. 417.

[40] Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 13; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 442 (1913).

[41] Delisle, no. 14. *Cf.* Round, *King's Serjeants*, pp. 199–201.

[42] Stapleton, I. 30, 99, 274, II. 471, 572 f.; *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XI. 410, note 14.

[43] Delisle, *Cartulaire*, no. 13; *id.*, *Henri II.*, nos. 120, 121, p. 209.

[44] Delisle, *Henri II.*, pp. 210, 271, 346.

[45] *Epistolae*, no. 95, in Migne, *Patrologia*, CCVII. 298.

be ascribed to the personality of William Fitz Ralph, who in 1178 came fresh from his experience as itinerant justice in England and held the office until his death in 1200, exerting an influence upon Norman law which may still be traced in the *Très Ancien Coutumier*.[46] As the *alter ego* of the king the seneschal was the head of the whole judicial system, and in his sovereign's absence he alone could preside in the judgment of those who had the privilege of appearing only before the duke or his chief justiciar.[47] We find him holding court, not only at Caen, where the traces of his activity are naturally better preserved, but at Argentan, Bernai, Longueville, Neufchâtel, St. Wandrille, and Rouen. With him sit such men as William de Mara, Richard Giffart, Richard of Argences, and John d'Éraines, archdeacon of Séez, who also in groups of two or three hold assizes in various parts of Normandy.[48] With no help from the Exchequer Rolls and only scattered references in the charters, it is impossible to define the composition of these assizes or determine how often they were held. In the documents the list of justices is often incomplete, and they are frequently indistinguishable from the other witnesses; yet we can identify many of them with the *baillis* and constables who meet us in the rolls, and occasionally an assize is held by a group of constables covering a considerable district. According to the custumal of 1199-1200, a doubtful witness upon such points, assizes are held once or twice a year in each *vicomté* and are attended by the ducal officers within the district and by the local lords, who are forbidden to hold their own courts during the session of the assize.[49] Full rolls are kept of the cases considered and the names of the jurors, and the clerks have also their little parchments to record the various fines and payments.[50] The theory still survives that all chattels of offenders are forfeited to the duke, for "the

[46] Delisle, pp. 219–220, 481–483; Tardif, *Très Ancien Coutumier*, p. 105; Valin, pp. 160–163, where the fines carried in later Pipe Rolls are wrongly taken as evidence that William was justice in England after 1178. The Norman roll of 1180 (pp. 56, 57) shows that he received pay for the full year 1179/80 and administered justice in a preceding year.

[47] For examples see Delisle, pp. 162, 219.

[48] See below, p. 290.

[49] *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 25–29, 36, 37, 44, 55, 56; Robert of Torigni, II. 117; Fréville has shown (*Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit*, 1912, pp. 715–724) that the *Très Ancien Coutumier* cannot be taken as an unmixed source for the judicial organization of the Plantagenet period; its statements respecting law and procedure are less likely to have been affected by French influence. The preponderance of the official element in the administration of justice in the twelfth century is well brought out by Fréville (pp. 682 ff.), who, however, goes too far in excluding the non-professional element. His studies of the meaning of the word baron in this period are worth pursuing further.

[50] *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 25, 28, 29, 65.

function of the sworn affearors is to declare what goods the offender has";[51] but there are maximum payments for the various classes of society, and knight and peasant enjoy exemption of their arms and means of livelihood in a way which suggests the well-known clause of *Magna Carta*.[52] The justices have a reputation for extortion on technical pretexts,[53] and the Exchequer Rolls show them bent on upholding the dignity and authority of their court by fines for contradiction and foolish speaking, for leaving its session without permission, and for disregarding or transgressing its decrees.[54] Even lords of the rank of Hugh de Longchamp and Hugh de Gournay are heavily mulcted for neglecting the summons to the regard of the forest.[55]

The ordinary local courts of the *vicomte* and *bailli* are not mentioned in the *Très Ancien Coutumier* and have left few traces in the charters. Early in the reign they had been ordered to meet once a month;[56] in the Avranchin the *vicomte* held pleas three times a year in Ardevon and Genest.[57] Once the sole agent of the duke in all departments of local administration, the *vicomte* saw his power greatly reduced by the development of the itinerant justices, and we have no means of knowing just what he still retained under the pleas which remained a constituent element of his farm. The newer jurisdictions of the *bailli* and constable have also to be reckoned with, and there were probably differences of local custom as well as changes in the course of the Angevin period. Thus the pleas of the sword regularly stood outside of the local farm[58] and fell naturally to the itinerant justices, yet in the district of Falaise a charter of Henry II. specifically reserves them to the *baillis*.[59] The local officers also possessed a minor civil jurisdiction, as we see from a writ in which Henry orders the constable and *baillis* of Cherbourg to do full justice

[51] Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law* (second ed.), II. 513.

[52] *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 55, 56; *Magna Carta*, c. 20; and on its interpretation, Tait and Pollard, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 720–728 (1912), XXVIII. 117 (1913).

[53] *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 65.

[54] Stapleton, I. 5, 16, 21, 34, 41, 51, 54, 58, 80, 86, 113, 116.

[55] *Ibid.*, I. 59, 74. On pleas of the forest see the Fécamp cartulary (MS. Rouen 1207), f. 36v.

[56] Robert of Torigni, II. 180; *ante*, part I. of this article, p. 37.

[57] Delisle, p. 346. *Cf.* the pleas held by Nigel, seneschal of Mortain, Stapleton, I. lxv, 11; Delisle, p. 408.

[58] This is specifically stated for the Hiesmois (see the following note), for the castle of Gaillon (Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 120), and for the *vicomté* of Bonneville and the *prévôtés* of Falaise and Domfront (*ibid.*, no. 111).

[59] *Cartulaire de Fontenay-le-Marmion* (ed. Saige), no. 1; Delisle, no. 509; *cf.* Valin, p. 227. Later they are held here by the itinerant justices, *Rotuli Normannie*, p. 20.

in a certain case unless the land in question be a knight's fee or a burgage of more than a hundred shillings' annual value, in which event the matter doubtless went to the higher court.[60] In general, however, the local writs are administrative rather than judicial,[61] and throw no light on the work of the local courts.

With respect to the criminal jurisdiction of the duke, we have a list of pleas of the sword drawn up before 1174,[62] elaborated at certain points in the earlier part of the *Très Ancien Coutumier*,[63] and confirmed by the fines recorded in the Exchequer Rolls and the cases reserved by Henry in his charters.[64] The enumeration includes murder and slaying, mayhem, robbery, arson, rape, and the plotted assault, offenses against the peace of the house, the plow, the duke's highway and the duke's court, against his army and his coinage. In large measure this list goes back to the Conqueror's time, when many of these pleas had already been granted to the great immunists, lay and ecclesiastical, who still continued to retain them under Henry.[65] Barons, however, whose courts encroach on the duke's jurisdiction must expect to be fined by his justices,[66] as must

[60] "H. Dei gratia rex Anglorum et dux Normannorum et Aquitaniorum et comes Andegavensium constabulario et baillivis suis re Cesarisburgo salutem. Precipio vobis quod sine dilatione plenum rectum teneatis priori et canonicis sancte Marie de Voto iuxta Cesarisburgum de terra que fuit Preisie apud Cesarisburgum et de domo quam ipsa eis dedit, quas Willhelmus Pichard et uxor Rither' eis difforciant, nisi sit feodum lorice vel burgagium quod valeat plusquam .c. solidos per annum. Et nisi feceritis iusticia mea Normannie faciat, ne amplius inde clamorem audiam pro defectu recti. Teste Hugone Bardulf dapifero apud Bonamvillam." Original, with fragment of *simple queue*, in Archives of the Manche, H. 1963. Printed from a poor copy by Bigelow, *History of Procedure*, p. 367; Round, no. 949; Delisle, no. 494 (1185–1189). A controversy concerning a mill is settled June 30, 1175, "in presentia W. de Huechon conestabularii regis": *Livre Blanc* of St. Martin of Séez, f. 13. *Cf.* the constable of Mortain, part I., note 72.

[61] For examples see Round, nos. 25, 26, 131, 205–207, 492 (where the original has "Beiesino" in the address), 939, 1282; Delisle, pp. 164 f., 179 f.

[62] *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 70. For the date see part I. of this article, note 22 (XX. 28).

[63] *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 15, 16, 35, 53, 54, 58, 59; *cf.* Pollock and Maitland, II. 455.

[64] Round, nos. 375, 382, 420; Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 16; *id.*, *Henri II.*, no. 495.

[65] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIII. 502–508 (1908); American Historical Review, XIV. 460–462 (1909). *Cf.* Powicke, pp. 80 ff.

[66] "Pro placitis ensis iniuste captis", Stapleton, I. 21. "Pro duello latrocinii male servato in curia sua. . . . pro duello de combustione male servato in curia sua", *ibid.*, I. 123. On the right of barons to hold pleas of the sword see American Historical Review, XIV. 461 (1909); Valin, pp. 220 ff.; Powicke, pp. 80–88. That the justices might sit in franchise courts is seen from a charter of John for William of Briouze (*Rotuli Normanniae*, p. 20; see Powicke, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXII. 18, 1907) and from the following extract from the cartulary of Savigny (f. 27v): "Fidelibus universis Guillelmus Avenel salutem. Sciatis quod Robertus pincerna et Guillelmus frater eius in presentia mea in curia comitis in

those who seek to settle such crimes out of court.[67] Since the early years of the reign men are fleeing the realm for murder, robbery, and similar offenses, which already bear the name of felonies,[68] and their chattels become a large element in the ducal revenues.[69] Nothing is said of their accusation by a jury of presentment, but we have seen reason for thinking that such juries were in use after 1159,[70] and the chattels of those who fail at the ordeal by water are accounted for in the roll of 1180 as they are in the Pipe Rolls after the Assize of Clarendon.[71] The pleas of the crown are viewed as a source of income analogous to the various portions of the ducal demesne; in the Avranchin, at least, they are in charge of a special officer, or coroner, as early as 1171.[72]

In civil matters the ducal courts had cognizance of disputes concerning church property, so far as these did not come under ecclesiastical jurisdiction,[73] and of such suits concerning land as involved the use of the recognition. From early times the property of churches and monasteries had been assimilated to the duke's own demesne (*sicut res mea dominica*) and charters repeatedly declare that particular establishments shall be impleaded only in the king's

plenaria assissa coram baronibus domini regis concesserunt monachis Savigneii . . . in manu mea qui tunc eram senescallus domini comitis Moretonii." *Cf.* the justices in the court of the Bishop of Lisieux, part I. of this article, note 105 (XX. 41). The baron's jealousy of losing his court is illustrated by the following: "B. de Sancto Walerico maiori et paribus communie Rothomagensis salutem et magnum amorem. Audivi quod vos misistis in placitum Walterum fratrem meum de masura mea que iuxta atrium beate Marie de Rothomago. Unde non parum miror, cum non defecerim alicui de recto tenendo. Mando igitur vobis quod dimittatis mihi curiam meam sicut alii barones regis vel etiam minores habent, quia libenter quando requisitus fuero rectum faciam". Cartulary of the chapter of Rouen (MS. Rouen 1093), f. 112.

67 Stapleton, I. 25–27, 32; *cf.* 26, 51; *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 36.

68 "Nisi sint fugitivi de terra mea pro muldro vel furto vel alio scelere": charter of Henry for Fécamp, not later than 1162, in Valin, p. 269; Delisle, no. 146; Round, no. 133, where a curious misreading of *indictum* makes the document relate to a court instead of a fair. In another charter of 1162 for Fécamp we have (Delisle, no. 147): "Habeant meam firmam pacem in eundo morando redeundo nisi nominati calumpniati fuerint de proditione vel felonia."

69 See the *catalla fugitivorum* in Stapleton, I. 4, 7, 10–12, 15, 16, 22, 23, 27, 29, 32–34, 43, 49, 55, 58, 72, 89, 94; Delisle, pp. 335, 339, 340, 343; and *cf.* *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 36, 37. In the cartulary of La Trinité de Caen, MS. Lat. 5650, f. 84v, we read in an inquest of this reign: "De feodo Rogeri Terrici fugitivi pro latrocinio inquirendum est ibidem."

70 *Supra*, part I., p. 37.

71 Stapleton, I. 62; and for England, Stubbs, *Benedictus*, II. lxii, note.

72 Delisle, p. 346; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXV. 710 f. (1910), XXVI. 326 f. (1911). For mention of coroners in England before 1194, see Gross, *Coroners' Rolls*, pp. xv–xix.

73 *Très Ancien Coutumier*, c. 53.

court, in some cases only before him or his principal justiciar.[74] The protection of possession by the duke, praised especially by the author of the first part of the *Très Ancien Coutumier* as a defense of the poor against the rich and powerful, is secured, as in England, by recourse to twelve lawful men of the vicinage. The possessory assizes described in this treatise[75] correspond to the four English assizes, and the Exchequer Rolls furnish abundant evidence that they were in current use by 1180.[76] On the other hand the principle that no man should answer for the title of his free tenement without royal writ does not seem to have been as broadly recognized in Normandy as in England, nor do we find anything which bears the name of the grand assize;[77] but its Norman analogues, the *breve de stabilia* and *breve de superdemanda,* appear in the early Exchequer Rolls,[78] as does also the writ of right.[79] In the few instances where comparison with Glanvill is possible, the Norman writs seem to have preserved their individuality of form, while showing general agreement in substance. Even in the duke's court, the law of Normandy has its differences from the law which is being made beyond the Channel, nor can we see that its development shows any dependence upon the law of England.

At this point our sketch of Norman institutions under Henry II. must draw to a close. The evidence is all too scanty, and while it would be easy to piece it out with English or French parallels, the result would not be Norman. It would be interesting also, were it possible, to seek to ascertain what, in an institutional sense, Normandy had given and received during a century and a quarter of union with England and during more than a generation of membership in the Plantagenet empire. Certainly the movement was not all in one direction. If the two chief figures in Norman administration in Henry's later years, Richard of Ilchester and William Fitz Ralph, had served an English apprenticeship, there had earlier in the reign been Norman precedents for Henry's English legislation.

[74] Brunner, *Schwurgerichte,* p. 238 ff.; Delisle, pp. 162, 219.

[75] Cc. 7, 16–19, 21, 23, 57. See Brunner, c. 15, who, however, points out that the Norman parallel to the assize *utrum,* the *breve de feodo et elemosina,* is a petitory writ.

[76] *E.g.,* Stapleton, I. 5, 12, 13, 19, 64, 65, 96, *cf.* 114, 115 (1184). *Cf.* Brunner, p. 307.

[77] Brunner, pp. 410–416.

[78] *Ibid.,* pp. 312–317; Stapleton, I. 11, 13, 29; Delisle, p. 339; *Très Ancien Coutumier,* c. 85. Tardif (p. lxxv) points out that the appearance of the seneschal's name in these writs carries them back of 1204, when the office was abolished.

[79] *Très Ancien Coutumier,* c. 30; and the numerous payments in the rolls *pro recto habendo.*

If the English military inquest of 1166 preceded the Norman returns of 1172, the Assize of Arms and the ordinance for the Saladin tithe were first promulgated for the king's Continental dominions. The order of these measures may have been a matter of chance, for to a man of Henry's temperament it mattered little where an experiment was first tried, but it was impossible to administer a great empire upon his system without using the experience gained in one region for the advantage of another. There was wisdom in Geoffrey's parting admonition to his son against the transfer of customs and institutions from one part of his realm to another,[80] but so long as there was a common element in the administration and frequent interchange of officers between different regions, it could not be fully heeded. A certain amount of give and take there must inevitably have been, and now and then it can definitely be traced. On the other hand, it must not be supposed that there was any general assimilation, which would have been a still greater impossibility. Normandy preserved and carried over into the French kingdom its individuality of law and character, and as a model of vigorous and centralized administration it seems to have affected the government of Philip Augustus in ways which are still dark to us. When that chapter of constitutional history comes to be written, if it ever can be written, it will illustrate from still another side the permanent importance of the creative statesmanship of the Norman dukes.

Charles H. Haskins.

Appendix

The roll of 1180, unlike the contemporary Pipe Rolls, throws no light upon the judges' circuits, save for the mention of William Fitz Ralph on page 57 and of Geoffrey le Moine on page 52 (*cf.* p. 78 and Round, no. 517); such indications are more abundant in the roll of 1195. The following list includes such assizes as I have noted in the latter part of Henry's reign and the early years of Richard; in them William Fitz Ralph regularly has the title of seneschal:

1. 1177, January; Caen. Richard, bishop of Winchester, Simon de Tornebu, Robert Marmion, William de Glanville as justices. Livre Noir, no. 95; Delisle, p. 347; Round, no. 1446.

2. 1176–1178; Montfort. Justices: William de Mara, *vicomte* of Ste.-Mère Église, William Malet, Hugh de Cressi, Seher de Quinci, Alvered de S. Martin, constables respectively of Pontaudemer, Rouen, Nonancourt, and Neufchâtel (Drincourt). Published incorrectly from the original in the Archives of the Seine-Inférieure by Valin, p. 271.

3. No date; Montfort. "Ista autem donatio facta est apud Montemfortem et recitata in plena asisia coram iusticiis domini regis, scilicet Seherio de Quenceio, Alveredo de Sancto Martino," etc. Fragment of Bec cartulary in Archives of the Eure, H. 91, f. 88v, no. 4.

[80] John of Marmoutier (ed. Halphen and Poupardin), p. 224 (ed. Marchegay, p. 292).

4. 1178/79; Neufchâtel. William Fitz Ralph holds court. Stapleton, p. 57.

5. 1180; Argentan. Agreement "in plena assisa . . . coram iusticiis domini regis". Witnessed by William Fitz Ralph, "qui preerat assise loco domini regis", William de Mara, Richard Giffart, John, count [of Ponthieu], Fulc d'Aunou, Raoul Tessun, and others. MS. Lat. 5424, p. 91; Collection Moreau, LXXXIV. 76.

6. Before 1182; Rouen. Judgment "in assisa apud Rothomagum in curia mea". Valin, p. 271; Round, no. 26; Delisle, no. 408.

7. 1183, January 20; Caen. "In curia domini regis . . . in plenaria assissa" before William Fitz Ralph and many others. Valin, p. 274; Round, no. 432; Delisle, no. 445A.

8. 1183; Caen(?). William Fitz Ralph and many others, none styled justices, but including William de Mara, Hamo Pincerna, Geoffrey Duredent, Jordan de Landa, Richard Fitz Henry, William de Calux, and Roger d'Arri. Delisle, p. 349; Valin, p. 276; Round, no. 437.

9. 1178–1183; Longueville. William Fitz Ralph and many other justices. Valin, p. 273.

10. 1184; S. Wandrille. Grant "in plenaria assisia coram Willelmo filio Radulfi senescallo et iustitia Normannie et multis aliis iusticiis, scilicet Willelmo de Mara, Seherio de Quinceio, Goscelino Rusel". Collection Moreau, LXXXVII. 157 (*cf.* f. 159), from lost cartulary of Lire; Le Prévost, *Mémoires et Notes pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eure,* II. 111.

11. 1184; Caen. "Hec finalis concordia facta fuit apud Cadomum in assisia coram Willelmo filio Radulfi senescallo Normannie et pluribus aliis qui tunc ibi aderant inter Robertum abbatem Sancte Marie de Monteborc et Henricum de Tilleio de ecclesia Sancte Marie de Tevilla, unde placitum erat inter eos in curia domini regis. . . . Testibus W. de Mara, Hamone Pincerna, W. de Romara, Radulfo de Haia, Rogero de Arreio, magistro Paridi, Radulfo de Wallamint, Iordano de Landa, Roberto de Curle, W. de Sauceio, Iohanne de Caretot, Willelmo Quarrel et pluribus aliis". Cartulary of Montebourg (MS. Lat. 10087), no. 474.

12. 1185; Caen. William Fitz Ralph and other justices hold assize; the final decision is given at the Exchequer before an important series of witnesses. Valin, p. 277; Round, no. 438.

13. 1186, January 30; Bayeux. Henry, bishop of Bayeux, William de Mara, Archdeacon John d'Éraines, and other justices whose names are not given. Livre Noir, no. 240.

14. 1186; Rouen. Agreement before William Fitz Ralph and Robert d'Harcourt (without title). Collection Moreau, LIX. 106, from the original; Round, no. 140.

15. 1186; Caen. Grant in presence of William Fitz Ralph, William de Mara, William Calviz, Richard Fitz Henry, Geoffrey de Rapendun "tunc baillivus regis", and others. MS. Lat. n. a. 1428, f. 18, from original at Carleton Castle.

16. 1187; Séez. Grant in assize "coram iusticiariis domini Henrici regis, scilicet coram Iohanne archidiacono de Arenis et Willelmo de Mara et aliis pluribus". Livre Blanc of S. Martin of Séez, f. 118v.

17. 1189–1190; Bernai. *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de la Trappe* (ed. Charencey), p. 199; *cf.* Valin, p. 116, note.

18. 1190, August 10; Argentan. Question of presentation "in curia domini regis. . . . Testibus Iohanne archidiacono Arenensi, Richardo de Argentiis, Willelmo de Obvilla constabulario Falasie, qui prefatam

assisiam tenuerant die festo Sancti Laurentii anno primo peregrinationis Philippi regis Francie et Ricardi regis Anglorum". Cartulary of S. Evroul (MS. Lat. 11055), no. 250.

19. 1190, August; Séez. Agreement in assize "coram iusticiariis domini regis Iohanne Oximensi archidiacono, Ricardo de Hummez comestabulario, W. de Ovilla, Ricardo de Argentiis". Livre Blanc of S. Martin, f. 134.

20. 1190; Bernai. "Coram Robert de Harecourt et Willelmo de Mara tunc iusticiis, Willelmo Tolomeo clerico, Richardo Sylvano, comite de Alençon, Richard Deri, et pluribus aliis". An assize at Montfort under Henry II. is mentioned. Archives of the Calvados, H. suppl. 486, f. 9.

21. 1190; Caen. Archives of the Calvados, H. 1872; *Mémoires des Antiquaires,* XV. 199; Round, no. 461.

22. 1191, October; Caen. William Fitz Ralph, Richard Silvain, Richard d'Argences, Hamo Pincerna, Richard Fitz Henry, Robert, abbot of Fontenay, Roger d'Arri, Gui de Vaac, Turstin of Ducey, Geoffrey the chamberlain, "Lucas pincerna, et alii multi" witness transaction in assize. Archives of the Calvados, H. 1868 (no. 46–18).

23. 1191; Rouen. Valin, p. 279.

24. 1191; Caen. Agreement "in curia domini regis apud Cadomum coram Willelmo filio Radulfi tunc temporis senescallo Normannie et Willelmo de Humetis constabulario domini regis et Roberto Wigorniensi episcopo et Ricardo Selvain et Ricardo de Argentiis, Willelmo Caluz, Ricardo filio Henrici, et pluribus aliis". Roger d'Arri is among the witnesses. Archives of the Calvados, H. 7077.

25. 1192; Rouen. Agreement in presence of William Fitz Ralph, William de Martigny, Richard d'Argences, Durand du Pin, and other justices. Chevreux and Vernier, *Les Archives de Normandie et de la Seine-Inférieure,* no. 35.

26. 1187–1193; Caudebec. Agreement "in plena assisia". Lot, *Études Critiques sur l'Abbaye de S. Wandrille,* p. 179, no. 114.

27. Undated; Caen. Grant in curia before William Fitz Ralph and the king's justices and barons, witnessed by William de Hummet constable, William de Mara, Hamo pincerna, Jordan de Landa, Richard Silvain, Richard d'Argences, and others. Archives of the Manche, H. 212.

28. No date; Bayeux. Grant "coram iustitiariis scilicet Willelmo Tolemeir et Ricardo de Argentiis dictam assisiam tenentibus". Archives of the Manche, H. 309.

29. No date; Bayeux. Grant in assize before William Pesnel, archdeacon of Avranches, William Tolomert, Hamo Pincerna, justices. Répertoire of de Gerville (Collection Mancel at Caen, MS. 296), p. 275, no. 21.

THE FAME OF SIR EDWARD STAFFORD

SOME years ago, the late Martin A. S. Hume, in his edition of the *Spanish State Papers, Elizabeth,* called attention to certain evidence in the correspondence of the Spanish ambassador at Paris which seemed to him to prove that Sir Edward Stafford, English ambassador to France from 1583 to 1587, played false to his sovereign and sold valuable information to the King of Spain at a time when England and Spain were virtually at war.[1] The charge was a grave one, involving as it did the good name of a man who had commonly been regarded as one of the stoutest vindicators of England's honor over seas. But Stafford did not lack a champion. Two years after the charge appeared Professor A. F. Pollard made a detailed examination of Hume's evidence and came to the conclusion that he had not by any means proved his case.[2] But neither Hume nor his critic went beyond the evidence of the *Spanish State Papers.* Recently, in the light of evidence from other sources, Professor Pollard's opinion has been called in question.[3] It seems therefore desirable that the whole matter be investigated afresh and that all available sources of information be exploited with a view to reaching some final conclusion as to Stafford's honesty while ambassador to France.

Sir Edward Stafford's political career and his political and religious opinions were in very large measure determined by his family connections. He was the son of Sir William Stafford and Dorothy Stafford. On his father's side he was closely connected by marriage with Queen Elizabeth herself. His father's first wife was Mary Boleyn, Elizabeth's aunt. This connection, though Sir Edward Stafford was the child of a later marriage, naturally gave him a special claim upon the queen's attention and increased measurably his opportunities for recognition and advancement at court. His mother's lineage was as distinguished as any in England, though its distinction was hardly of a sort to commend it to a Tudor sovereign. Dorothy Stafford was the child of a union between the house of Stafford and the house of Pole, both of which had cherished pretensions to the English throne. Her paternal grandfather, the

[1] *Calendar of Letters and State Papers relating to English Affairs preserved in, or originally belonging to, the Archives of Simancas,* vol. IV., *Elizabeth,* 1587–1603 (London, 1899), *passim.*

[2] *English Historical Review,* XVI. 572–577 (1901).

[3] *Ibid.,* XXVIII. 51, note 69 (1913).

third duke of Buckingham, had lost his head on that score in 1521 and her brother, Sir Thomas Stafford, had lost his, for very much the same reason, in 1557.[4] The Poles had not been so aggressively disposed to assert their royal claims but had been remarkable for their zeal for the Roman Catholic Church. Cardinal Reginald Pole, of course, had been largely instrumental in the reconciliation of England with Rome under Queen Mary. So Sir Edward Stafford received from his mother an inheritance which, to the eyes of Elizabeth as a Tudor, was bad politically and to her eyes as an Anglican, bad ecclesiastically. It is not unlikely that this tremendous birthright had an adverse effect upon his fortunes, though his mother, as a matter of fact, was one of the queen's favorite ladies-in-waiting and enjoyed a considerable amount of influence at court.[5] The consciousness that he had some claim to be royal master may account for his restlessness and impatience as royal servant. It does not appear, however, that he ever cast his eyes along the road which had led his great-grandfather and his uncle to destruction.

Sir Edward's second marriage contributed another significant factor to the shaping of his public career. His second wife, Douglas Howard, was the granddaughter of Thomas Howard, the hero of Flodden Field, and the sister of Lord Admiral Howard of Armada fame. She had been married twice already when Stafford espoused her, first to Lord Sheffield, afterwards, secretly, to the Earl of Leicester, the royal favorite. Leicester never acknowledged the marriage and cast Douglas aside later when he found another lady more to his fancy. The Lady Sheffield, as she was generally called, was a woman of vigorous character. She was not unnaturally possessed by a passionate hatred for Leicester and, like almost all the Elizabethan Howards, was secretly inclined towards Roman Catholicism. Her influence on Stafford, whom she married in 1578, was great.[6] She certainly stimulated, if she did not create, his hostility towards Leicester and was no doubt partly responsible for his leanings towards the Roman Catholic party.

In the year of his marriage Stafford entered Queen Elizabeth's service as special envoy to France in connection with the second Alençon courtship. During the next four years he spent most of his time at that business. In such wise he served his apprenticeship in diplomacy. He also enlarged his acquaintance in France, partic-

[4] *Cf.* the lives of Sir Edward and his relatives in the *Dict. of Nat. Biography.*

[5] She was Mistress of the Robes. There are several interesting references to her in the *Spanish Calendar, Elizabeth,* vols. III. and IV.

[6] *Cf.* the lives of Howard, Leicester, and Stafford in the *Dict. of Nat. Biography.*

ularly among Alençon's immediate followers. With Simier and Marchaumont, Alençon's closest confidants, he was especially intimate. The Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary Stuart's ambassador in France, declared later that Stafford was altogether governed by Marchaumont.[7] Whether this was true or not, it is clear that Stafford's association with these men was not altogether to his advantage. They encouraged his naturally extravagant habits[8] and his love of gaming. He admitted later to Burghley that he had lost some six or seven thousand crowns in play with them.[9]

Stafford's connection with the Alençon marriage negotiations brought him into very intimate association with the queen. It also served to define his relations to her principal councillors. The Privy Council divided upon the question of this match. Burghley, Sussex, and the more conservative members favored it. Leicester, Walsingham, and the younger more ardent members opposed it.[10] Since Stafford was an enthusiastic supporter of the marriage from the first,[11] he found himself aligned with the conservatives. But his agreement with them was not by any means confined to this particular question. Like Sussex he hated Leicester, and that hatred, aggravated by his marriage to Leicester's cast-off wife, committed him perforce to the party opposed to the favorite. Furthermore, his family connections with the Howards and the Poles naturally inclined him to a conservative, if not to a reactionary, position upon the fundamental question of religion. He was indeed an indifferent Protestant and not at all in sympathy with a policy designed to exploit the resources of England in support of the Protestant faith. Here again he broke sharply with the militant Puritanism of Leicester and his colleagues. Under these circumstances it is not surprising to discover that Stafford, from the very beginning of his public career, enrolled himself under Burghley's banner and professed to be Burghley's man. Since he was a quick-tempered, out-

[7] *Cf.* Glasgow to Mary Stuart, January, 1585, in St. P. Mary, Queen of Scots, vol. XV., f. 1 (English Public Record Office).

[8] Throughout his life he seems to have been almost always in debt. There is a letter in the *Cal. St. P. Foreign, Elizabeth,* 1581–1582, dated April 19, 1582 (p. 631), from Mallart, probably a Parisian jeweller, to Walsingham, asking him to speak to Stafford about a bill for 250 crowns for pearls. Further evidence of Stafford's debts will be found in *Hatfield Calendar,* III. 212 (Hist. MSS. Comm. Rept., *Salisbury*), and in the *Calendar, Spanish, Eliz.,* vols. III. and IV., *passim.* The matter is discussed more at length later.

[9] St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139.

[10] *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* XXVIII. 34 ff. (1913).

[11] His arguments in favor of the match are set forth in *Hatfield Calendar,* II. 239–245. *Cf.* also *Spanish Calendar,* 1580–1586, *passim,* and *Foreign Calendar,* 1578–1580, *passim.*

spoken person he was almost equally frank in proclaiming his hostility to Leicester and all his tribe. As a natural consequence, he provoked the antagonism of both Leicester and Walsingham. Walsingham in particular never trusted him and since Walsingham, as principal secretary, had charge of the queen's foreign affairs, his distrust had a very profound effect upon Stafford's fortunes as English ambassador to France.

By Stafford's own account, the first intimation of an intention to send him as resident ambassador to the French court came from Walsingham himself. Stafford wrote to Burghley on June 12, 1583:

> The matter I crave your Lordship's advice and to use your friendship in is this: Mr. Secretary, the night before we went to Theobald's, called me into the presence window and asked me what mind I had and whether I would be content to go into France, Sir Henry Cobham pressing to come home and the Queen not willing to send Middlemore by reason of his weakness. I answered him that I was born to serve her and so both must and would do, but desired him to provide for me, if he meant to prefer me thereunto, that I might do it with some ability, both for the better credit of her Majesty's service and her own reputation. So he, being called away to come to the Queen, without speaking to me of it, or I to him since of that, till yesterday that he called me in the lobby door and told me he had presented my name to the Queen among some others, telling me that, at the naming of me, and he speaking better of my ability to serve her than I deserve, she confessed I was fit but very poor. He asked me if I liked to have him to press her any further. He would do it if I would. I desired him not by any means and so left. For I have wholly disposed myself to depend of your good counsel and help, to do what you think best and to go as far and to do as much and as little as you think good. . . . Good my lord, do me the favor to give me your advice; first, if you will like of it at all, then how far and how much you like of, assuring your Lordship I will follow your advice and commandment in every point and observe it. If you like not of it, never to speak of it more; if you like of it, then only to depend upon your preferment to her Majesty, which I humbly crave and, if I have it, then I protest to follow the course I have done heretofore in all my negotiations, to depend upon nobody's favor but her Majesty's will and your honorable counsel.[12]

It is obvious from the tone of this letter that Stafford was willing enough to serve as ambassador in France, but was determined not to accept the position at Walsingham's hands. It is equally obvious that he was inviting Burghley to play the patron. In another part of the same letter he confessed that he was miserably poor. He had some six hundred pounds a year through his wife, he said, but he indicated no other source of income. He thought however that his friends would stand security for a loan of "a couple of thousand pounds" and hoped the queen would lend him that much without interest.

12 Harleian MSS. 6993, f. 44 (British Museum).

Whether his resources were as mean as he made them out to be it is impossible to say. It was customary for Elizabethans, entering the queen's service, to plead poverty, in the hope perhaps of securing an increase of allowance. There is no doubt, however, that both before and after this time, Stafford's finances were in a bad way.

Stafford was finally appointed ambassador to France in September, 1583, and he went over to Paris late in the same month.[13] Whoever was ultimately responsible for his appointment, it is evident that he began his embassy deeply pledged to Burghley's service and deeply distrustful of, if not openly hostile to, Leicester and Walsingham. The Spanish ambassador in Paris spoke of him later as Burghley's "creature".[14]

It is pretty clear that from the first the English Catholic refugees in France and the agents of Mary Stuart as well had hopes of Stafford. His family connections probably led them to believe that he was not altogether out of sympathy with their point of view. Not long after his arrival in France Charles Paget, one of the most notorious of the English refugees in Paris, and the Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary's ambassador at the French court, both came to see him. Stafford for his part declared his intention to exploit them for all they were worth. "I mean to use them all well", he wrote to Walsingham on October 27, "if they come to me . . . . For my part I am minded to use the Devil himself well if he could come to me in the likeness of a man to serve the Queen withal."[15] Four days later Stafford wrote to Walsingham again:

> I doubt not but I will keep that hand on them here that I will keep credit with them here and yet serve her Majesty truly and well. And if her Majesty do seem to the French ambassador there, or sometimes openly, to stand in some jealousy of my partiality of this part, so it be not so often and openly that he may easily find it, I do not doubt but to serve her turn with that manner of dealing very well, *sub intelligitur*, that her use of her speaking of it commonly do not bring her with use of it to think it inwardly.[16]

Stafford's professed intention was to pretend to favor the Roman Catholic cause in order to get information serviceable to the queen. To that end he also entertained the advances of Lord Paget and Charles Arundel who fled to Paris from England late in the autumn of 1583 in consequence of the discovery of the Throgmorton plot.

[13] His instructions, dated September, 1583, are preserved at the English Public Record Office (St. P. France, X.). On his departure for France, *cf. Hatfield Calendar*, III. 12, and *Span. Cal.*, 1580–1586, p. 500.

[14] *Span. Cal.*, 1587–1603, p. 7.

[15] St. P. France, vol. X., no. 65.

[16] *Ibid.*, no. 67.

Leaving aside for the moment the question as to whether Stafford's intentions were honest or not, the immediate consequence of his commerce with the Catholic refugees was to increase his ill-feeling towards Walsingham. Walsingham had written him to keep an eye on Paget and Arundel and had added: "Her Majesty hath willed me to signify to you, that she is assured that the alliance that my Lady, your wife, hath with them, shall not make you to be more remiss to perform your duty towards her."[17] Stafford at once took offense. He sent a copy of Walsingham's letter to Burghley and wrote:

> I have sent your Lordship the very words of Mr. Secretary's letter to me . . . and I leave to your Lordship's judgment to judge whether any man that can see any farther than the end of his nose, may not judge or think, that there is an evil meaning in the writer, and to suspect that there is an intention, if it be not already done, to make her [the queen] that it is written from, in her name, to think as evil as they mean.[18]

From this time forward Stafford appears to have been convinced of Walsingham's hostile attitude towards him. He complained to Burghley that Walsingham was intercepting his letters, interfering with his secret service, and in general trying to diminish his credit both at home and abroad.[19] He attributed entirely to Walsingham's influence the directions he received from the queen to forbear dealing with the Pagets and Arundel altogether.

> I find by proof [he wrote to Burghley on April 6, 1584] that they do what they can to have me have a disgrace. . . . If I had not so bad friends at home as I have and might follow that course that I could best find expedient here without danger of false interpretation, your Lordship should find I would know more of their secrets than I do. But to hazard the peril of evil disposed persons' power to have things misconstrued and to have things well meant evil taken, I had rather than to venture to do well and have no thanks, not to hazard so much and sleep in a whole skin.[20]

How far Walsingham at this time entertained the suspicions that Stafford attributed to him is hard to say. There is no doubt that from the first he suspected that Stafford's secretary, a man named Lilly, was supplying information to Thomas Morgan, one of

17 *Ibid.*, no. 94, printed in *Hardwicke Papers*, I. 212. On Lady Stafford's connection with the Catholic refugees in France *cf.* Stafford to Elizabeth, December 26, 1583, *Hardwicke Papers*, I. 215.

18 *Hardwicke Papers*, I. 212. Stafford's original draft for this letter is in the British Museum (Cotton MSS., Galba E vi., f. 189b). The version in the *Hardwicke Papers* contains verbal inaccuracies.

19 *Cf.* Stafford's letters to Burghley of April 13 and 16 and May 1, 1584, St. P. France, vol. XI., ff. 175, 179, 192.

20 Cotton MSS., Galba E vi., f. 210.

Mary Stuart's most active partizans in Paris.[21] Stafford himself scoffed at the idea and ascribed it to Walsingham's animosity. Nevertheless, there is evidence to prove that the suspicion was well grounded.[22] In the late summer of 1584 Walsingham also discovered, or said he had discovered, that another one of Stafford's servants, Michael Moody by name, was secretly conveying letters from Catholic refugees in France to their friends in England.[23] But the only evidence that Walsingham suspected Stafford himself of treacherous dealings at this time lies in Stafford's own statements to that effect. In view of what follows, it seems not unlikely that Stafford interpreted Walsingham's attitude correctly. There is however no evidence to prove that, up to the end of the year 1584 at any rate, any such suspicions were justifiable.

From the very beginning of 1585, however, the shadows begin to gather about Stafford's integrity. In January of that year the Archbishop of Glasgow wrote to Mary Stuart from Paris that he had gone to see Stafford and that in course of conversation Stafford had told him confidentially that he feared the Earl of Leicester would attempt something against Mary's life. According to Glasgow both Stafford and his wife professed to be Mary's very affectionate servants.[24] A few weeks later, Thomas Morgan wrote to Mary on the same subject. Charles Arundel, he said, had urged Stafford to accept a pension and to offer his services to Mary and to the Roman Catholic Church. According to Morgan's report,

[21] Stafford to Walsingham, October 31, 1583, St. P. France, vol. X., no. 67, and same to same, December 12, 1583, *ibid.*, vol. X., no. 100, and Stafford to Burghley, November 6, 1586, *ibid.*, vol. XVI., f. 139.

[22] The Archbishop of Glasgow wrote to Mary Stuart in January, 1585, that Morgan had brought Lilly to him with some information from the English embassy and added that since Mary's treasurer had not paid Lilly's pension, he, Glasgow, meant to advance the sum due. St. P. Mary Queen of Scots, vol. XV., f. 1. This letter makes it clear not only that Lilly was hand-in-glove with Morgan but also that he was a pensioner of Mary Stuart's.

[23] Stafford to Walsingham, January 1584/5, St. P. France, vol. XII., f. 45. There is no direct proof that this charge was just, but Stafford himself found some reason to suspect Moody of base designs (*cf.* Stafford to Burghley, April 13, 1584, in St. P. France, vol. XI., f. 175) and later, while a prisoner in Newgate, he became involved in the so-called Des Trappes plot to murder the queen. *Hatfield Calendar*, III. 233; *Cal. Domestic, Addenda*, 1580–1625, pp. 200–203. These facts tend to confirm Walsingham's estimate of him. In a French account of the Des Trappes plot, Moody is said to have been a prisoner for debt. Teulet, *Relations Politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse*, IV. 146. Burghley speaks of Moody in the same connection as "a mischievous, resolute person". *Hatfield Cal.*, III. 224.

[24] St. P. Mary Queen of Scots, vol. XV., f. 1. Glasgow bore further testimony to Stafford's friendliness towards Mary in a letter to Mary of March 21, 1586. St. P. Mary Queen of Scots, vol. XVII., no. 31, printed by Labanoff, *Lettres de Marie Stuart*, VII. 175.

Stafford had replied that he would remain faithful to Elizabeth while she lived and would meanwhile do everything in his power to promote good feeling between Elizabeth and Mary.[25] Neither of these letters in themselves proves that Stafford was playing the traitor. Both may be interpreted to mean that he was simply pretending to favor Mary's cause in order to gain the confidence of her servants and so to advance Elizabeth's interests.[26] But it is evident that he was on intimate terms at this juncture both with the Archbishop of Glasgow and with Charles Arundel. Probably Walsingham became aware of this fact through his secret channels of information. Consequently his distrust of Stafford increased.[27]

Some time in the late summer of 1585 he sent Thomas Rogers (alias Nicholas Berden), one of his cleverest secret agents, to France to spy upon the English Catholics there.[28] It is probable that

[25] Murdin, *State Papers,* p. 462. Mary Stuart's letter to Glasgow in reply to his letter referred to (Labanoff, *Lettres de Marie Stuart,* VI. 363) proves that his letter reached her.

[26] This was the defense which Stafford himself offered. Glasgow's and Morgan's letters both fell into the hands of the English government when Mary's papers were seized in 1586. On October 2, 1586, Burghley wrote to Stafford: "I must let you know that, upon Interception of letters of *Morgan* and the *Archbishop of Glasgow,* sent from thence to the Scottish Queen, Reports have been made *of you* to bear some Favour to *her.*" Murdin, p. 570. Stafford, in his reply to Burghley's letter, dated November 6, 1586, wrote: "For these reports that have been made to me of the interception of letters to *the Queen of Scots,* I cannot tell upon what grounds they should come. I wrote, July 18th, 1585, to Mr. Secretary to say that the *Archbishop of Glasgow* and some other, both French and of our nation, had asked me to show favor to the *Queen of Scots,* and had tried to see if I could be made flexible to help to some means to send to the *Queen of Scots.* I could not (to keep them in hand still with some opinion that I might be drawn to pleasure her till such time as I heard back again of her Majesty's will in it) carry myself, as I take it, otherwise nor more discreetly than by my moderate speech of her, tendering rather to the wooing of her than otherwise, leave them to live in hope that by little and little I might be drawn to pleasure her, and having received commandment not to deal in it, if I had, upon a sudden, showed another change in me unto hard terms against her, I must plainly have discovered myself openly, then, to have meant (as I did) cunning with them, under colour that I had thought of the matter and essayed some means which could not be now brought to pass by any means and therefore desired them to be contented and in truth, since, they did never speak to me of it. If upon this they took some heart i' grace and have written hope to the *Queen of Scots,* of me, I know not." St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139. The passages in italics are in cipher in the original. The letter which Stafford refers to here of July 18, 1585, is missing. His defense confirms the statement that both Glasgow and Morgan had been making approaches to him.

[27] It may be noted in passing that one of Navarre's agents at Paris, the Abbé del Bene, also distrusted Stafford, as appears from his letter to Buzanvals of April 30, 1586. St. P. France, vol. XV., f. 273. Stafford saw this letter and alludes to it in his letter to Burghley of November 6, 1586. St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139.

[28] A good many of Rogers's letters from Paris are given in the *Cal. St. P.*

Walsingham charged Rogers to have an eye to Stafford as well. At any rate, some time after Rogers returned to England he made a report on Stafford to Francis Mills, one of Walsingham's secretaries. From this report the following extract is quoted:

Sir,

According to your direction I have hereunto set down the matter that concerneth the Lord Ambassador, which matter, being both dishonourable and very perilous, is worthy to be noticed and wisely to be foreseen.

First, by a letter which Thomas Fitzherbert wrote to Geoffrey Foljambe I do find that the Lord Ambassador, in consideration of 6000 crowns and in performance of his promise did show to the Duke of Guise his letters of intelligence out of England.

Secondly, that he imparteth also his said secrets to Charles Arundel. . . .

Thirdly, there was a captain that had served in the Low Countries (whose name I remember not) that passed by Rheims towards Paris, who had a packet of letters from Dr. Gifford and others to Charles Arundel and others at Paris, who presented the said packet to the Lord Ambassador, but he delivered the letters again to him to carry into England and gave secret notice to Fitzherbert and the rest to seek out the party and to procure his letters out of his hands. . . .

And further I find that Arundel can send any man into England by the ambassador's means, which is very necessary to be looked unto; and Arundel did secretly procure letters of commendation on my behalf to his honor for my return into England upon hope that I should or would r[eceive] his letters at his return from Spain, which maketh me think that I shall hear from him if he be returned.

Lastly, it was concluded between the ambassador and the rest that the better to increase his credit in England they would deliver him from time to time such intelligence, or the first fruits of the books or libels as should first come forth and be grateful unto him, which was curiously observed by the papists for all common matters, but for other matters, they never troubled his head withal.[29]

Briefly, Rogers charged Stafford with being on confidential terms with Arundel, with forwarding papists' letters, with providing means for Catholic refugees to despatch letters and messengers to their friends in England, and with revealing valuable secrets to Arundel. The gravest of the charges, however, was that Stafford was being successfully bribed by the Duke of Guise to show him the English despatches.

Domestic, Addenda, 1580–1625, pp. 158 ff. Some information regarding Rogers is given in an article entitled "Mary Queen of Scots and the Babington Plot", by Father J. H. Pollen, in *The Month* for September, 1907. Exactly when Rogers returned to England is not certain. He was certainly in England on July 21, 1586. (There is a paper of this date in his handwriting which was certainly written in England, in St. P. Domestic, vol. CXCI., no. 23.)

[29] St. P. France, vol. XVIII., f. 370. This paper is undated and unsigned. It is in Rogers's handwriting and was probably written in the summer of 1586, shortly after his return from France.

In weighing the value of this testimony against Stafford's integrity, it is necessary to bear in mind that Rogers was a professional spy. The nature of his occupation was not such as to attract honest men. Most of Walsingham's secret agents were disreputable characters and Rogers was no better, although rather cleverer, than his fellows. Indeed, his success as a spy was largely due to the fact that he was a past master in the arts of deceit. Most of the information with which he supplied Walsingham he gained by pretending to be an agent of the Roman Catholics. Under these circumstances it may fairly be urged that he was not above deceiving Walsingham himself. He was no doubt aware that Walsingham suspected Stafford's honesty, he was naturally desirous of cultivating Walsingham's good graces, and he may very well have borne false witness against Stafford upon the supposition that any testimony damaging to the ambassador's character would be welcome to the secretary. So that Rogers's charges in themselves can hardly be taken as conclusive proof of Stafford's treachery.[30]

But Rogers's testimony does not stand alone. Some time in the early autumn of 1585 Bernardino de Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador at Paris, reported that he had good reason to believe that Stafford might be bribed to furnish information to the King of Spain.[31] Again, in May, 1586, Mendoza wrote to his master:

> Charles Arundel, an English gentleman, to whom your Majesty granted eighty crowns pension a month, in respect of the queen of Scot-

[30] There is evidence that Walsingham set another spy upon Stafford in 1587. This spy was none other than the notorious Gilbert Gifford, who returned to France after his betrayal of Mary Stuart and served for a time as a secret agent for England in Paris until he was finally discovered. His correspondence from Paris (unsigned, but easily identified by his curiously immature handwriting) is mostly preserved among the St. P. Domestic in the English Public Record Office. Some of it is adequately calendared in the *Cal. Domestic, Addenda*, 1580–1625. Gifford wrote to Thomas Philipps, Walsingham's secretary, April 26, 1587: "Il nostro vecchio is not now to be depended on . . . neither is the English ambassador in any case to be used for causes well known to you already, which daily increase." St. P. Domestic, vol. CC., no. 49. Again he wrote in July, 1588: "Fitzherbert continueth Arundel's course for Stafford. All the world marvels how he is spared." St. P. Domestic, vol. CCXII., no. 54. Stafford wrote to Burghley January 8, 1587/8: "Within this fortnight, Gilbert Gifford is taken with a queane a bed, and after he was gone, seeking his chamber, letters have been found written to him by Mr. Secretary's commandment, as they write to him to egg him to inquire of me, and he hath confessed that, being heartened to it, he hath written of me, of Lilly my man, of Grimston my man, so many things that both I and mine are in worse predicament than the rankest traitors that are on this side the seas. I have some of the letters, both of the originals out of England and his answers in his own hand. I hope to have more." St. P. France, vol. XVIII., f. 11. *Cf.* also Stafford's letters to Walsingham of December, 1587, in *Cal. Domestic, Addenda*, 1580–1625, pp. 221–222, 223–230.

[31] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1580–1586, pp. 528–529.

land, was constantly in the house of the English ambassador here when he was in Paris, which Muzio [the Duke of Guise] assures me was at his instructions, as the English ambassador was needy, and he, Muzio, had given him 3,000 crowns. In return for this the ambassador gave him certain information through this Charles Arundel.[32]

Here Mendoza makes precisely the same charge against Stafford that Rogers had made, namely, that he was receiving money from the Duke of Guise in return for information. Since it is hardly possible that Mendoza and Rogers were in collusion in this matter and since Mendoza got his information from Guise himself, there can be little doubt that the gravest charge which Rogers made against Stafford was essentially a just one and that Stafford was, as early as the autumn of 1586, if not earlier, playing the traitor.[33]

By the end of the year 1586 these facts about Stafford can fairly be said to be well substantiated: first, that Walsingham suspected him of treachery; secondly, that the two most active of Mary Stuart's agents in France, Thomas Morgan and the Archbishop of Glasgow, both believed that Stafford might be serviceable in Mary's cause; thirdly, that Charles Arundel asserted that Stafford could be bribed; fourthly, that one of Walsingham's spies in France directly accused Stafford of selling information to the Duke of Guise; fifthly, that the Duke of Guise himself told the Spanish ambassador in Paris that he had paid money to Stafford and had received information from him. None of these facts absolutely proves that Stafford had treacherous intentions towards his sovereign. He may have been merely posing as a traitor before Arundel and Guise and the rest in order to learn more completely the purposes and plans of Elizabeth's enemies. But there is very little evidence to support this explanation of his conduct and the facts just stated certainly establish a strong presumption against his honesty. It is with them in mind that one should approach the further evidences of his infidelity revealed in the fourth volume of the *Spanish State Papers, Elizabeth.*

On January 24, 1587, Mendoza wrote to Philip II. that the King of Navarre had written to Elizabeth complaining that Stafford was supplying certain information to the Duchess of Guise. Apparently Mendoza heard of this through Charles Arundel, who had it in turn from Stafford himself. Mendoza went on to say:

Charles Arundell tells me that Stafford flew into a terrible rage at this, and swore he would never be satisfied until he had been revenged

[32] *Cal. St. P. Spanish,* 1580–1586, p. 575.

[33] Later in the same year Mendoza bore testimony again to Stafford's treachery. *Cf. ibid.,* p. 648.

on Bearn [Navarre] and the other too, no matter by what means; and that now was the time for your Majesty to make use of him (Stafford) if you wished any service done. He pressed Arundell to ascertain from your Majesty in what way he might serve you, and you should see by his acts how willing he was to do so. . . . This ambassador is much pressed for money, and even if he had not made such an offer as this, his poverty is reason enough to expect from him any service, if he saw it was to be remunerated.

Mendoza went on to say that just as he was about to sign his letter Charles Arundel brought news from Stafford that a fleet was about to be despatched from England against Portugal.

The ambassador told Arundell to advise your Majesty of this instantly, which, he said, would serve as a sample and hansel of his goodwill; and within a fortnight or three weeks he would report whether the despatch of the fleet was being persisted in, together with the exact number of ships, men, stores and all other details of the project. . . . As it is very important that your Majesty should have prompt advice of such armaments, although the ambassador appears ready enough to give intelligence on that, or any other point in your Majesty's interest, it will nevertheless be advisable to send him 2000 crowns with which to buy a jewel.[34]

Philip II. replied to this letter on February 27, 1587, as follows:

The new correspondent whom you have obtained to keep you informed on English affairs is very appropriate. You may thank the intermediary from me and urge him to continue in his good service. Give the other one the 2000 crowns, or the jewel you suggest of similar value, although it may be more secret and he may prefer that it should be given in money, through the same intermediary.[35]

There can be no doubt that the "new correspondent" here referred to is Stafford, and the intermediary Arundel. Nor can there be any doubt that the King of Spain was about to give Stafford 2000 crowns or its equivalent for value received.

In a letter from Mendoza to Philip written about a month later, on March 26, Mendoza referred again to this matter: "The new confidant wishes to have an interview with me, and as soon as a certain person leaves his home I will give him the 2000 crowns which your Majesty has been pleased to grant him. I have also thanked the third party."[36]

Evidently the "new confidant" refers here to Stafford and the "third party" to Arundel. In view of this letter the statement by Professor Pollard that the hypothesis which identifies Stafford with

34 *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, pp. 7–8.
35 *Ibid.*, p. 25.
36 *Ibid.*, p. 46.

the "new confidant" is contradicted on every page of the *Spanish Calendar* needs some modification to say the least.

Stafford's next appearance in the *Spanish Calendar* in this connection is under the appellation "new friend". Professor Pollard does not believe that this term should be interpreted to mean Stafford, but Mendoza's letter to Philip of April 27, 1587, with its reference to the 2000 crowns already mentioned, furnishes pretty conclusive evidence to the contrary. Mendoza wrote: "Since my last I have seen the new friend who had expressed a desire for an interview. I thanked him from your Majesty for his goodwill, and gave him the 2000 crowns which your Majesty ordered, through the third person who was present."[37]

It is evident that on some occasions, at any rate, the terms "new correspondent", "new confidant", and "new friend", as used in the *Spanish Calendar,* cannot refer to anyone else but Sir Edward Stafford. It is therefore fair to presume that these terms, when they occur in the Spanish despatches at this time, refer to Stafford unless there be positive evidence to the contrary. Professor Pollard has undertaken to prove that these terms cannot possibly stand for Stafford by pointing out that "new friend" and "new confidant" are often spoken of in the despatches in such conjunction with the English ambassador as to establish the fact that they were different persons. For example, he quotes the following passage among several others: "The new confidant informs me that the English ambassador has seen Secretary Pinart."

On the face of it this evidence seems fairly conclusive. But Professor Pollard has not taken account of the fact that Philip and Mendoza were both anxious to prevent their dealings with Stafford from becoming known. Despatches were often intercepted and often deciphered. It may therefore have seemed wise to the king and to his servant to pretend to make two persons out of the "new friend" and the "English ambassador" when they were in reality only one. So when Mendoza reported that the "new confidant" had sent him certain news gathered from Stafford's despatches, absurd as it may seem to Professor Pollard, Mendoza may simply be using this form of circumlocution to conceal the fact that Stafford was supplying news from his own despatches. Since it has already been established that "new confidant" and "new friend" do certainly, at times, stand for Stafford, this hypothesis is at least worth trying.

One of the examples which Professor Pollard quotes is from a letter of Philip to Mendoza of June 20, 1587. Philip wrote: "I

[37] *Cal. St. P. Spanish,* 1587–1603, pp. 74–75.

note what the new friend told you about the wish of the English to form a closer union with the Christian King, and the active steps that were being taken with that object by the English ambassador."

Here plainly Philip would have us believe that "new friend" and "English ambassador" were two different persons. Further along in the same letter Philip uses the term "new friend" again: "The remark made by the new friend to Belièvre about my rights to the English crown had better have been left unsaid."[38]

This comment has reference to a letter from Mendoza of May 20 containing a long account of an interview between Stafford and Belièvre on the question of the English succession, in the course of which Stafford had asserted Philip's claim to the English throne.[39] It is plain therefore that Philip uses the term "new friend" in this connection to apply to Stafford, though earlier in the same letter he has made them out to be two different persons. This is sufficient to prove that the pretended distinction between them was merely a blind devised by the king and his ambassador to conceal Stafford's treachery.

The channel of communication was no sooner established between the "new friend" and the Spaniards than Mendoza began to exploit what he made out to be a new source of information from a correspondent whom he called Julius or Julio. Hume holds that Julio was merely another name for Stafford. Professor Pollard makes strong objection to this interpretation. He points out that the Spanish despatches in the first place represent Julio and Stafford as having been two different persons and, in the second place, make it evident that Julio was sending news from England and so cannot possibly be identified with an English ambassador resident in Paris. It is perfectly clear that the despatches support both of Professor Pollard's contentions. But the question naturally arises whether, in the case of Julio as in the case of the "new friend", the distinction made between Spanish pensioner and English ambassador was not made simply for purposes of concealment and whether the locating of Julio in London was not, after all, merely another device contrived to pull wool over the eyes of English spies.

In regard to the first point, Philip's marginal annotations to Mendoza's allusions to Julio are illuminating. Against one reference to Julio the king writes: "I think Julius must here mean the confidant [*i. e.*, Stafford] as it is to him that Cecil writes."[40] And again when Mendoza writes: "Julius advises me that the queen of England has

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 107.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 86.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

written to her ambassador here," Philip remarks: "I think he must be the same man."[41]

Whether Philip was right or wrong it is evident from his observations that Mendoza's obvious effort to draw a distinction between Julio and Stafford did not prevent his master from believing, and therefore need not prevent us from believing, that they were the same person.

With regard to the second point that Professor Pollard makes, namely, that Julio was in England, there can be no doubt that Mendoza sought to convey that impression. But he sometimes forgot himself. In September, 1587, he wrote:

> Julius has informed me that Drake's voyage is abandoned, as he has been assured by letters from Cecil. These are things that Cecil and Walsingham are in the habit of writing to him. . . . Julius has again been approached on behalf of Épernon with regard to the capture of one of your Majesty's frontier fortresses.[42]

From this passage it is pretty clear that in September, 1587, at any rate, Julio was in France. Where else would Épernon have been likely to approach him? And why, if he was in England, did Walsingham and Burghley both write him English news? From Mendoza's letter of November 18, 1587, it is clear enough that, at that date also, Julio was not in England: "Julius", he wrote, "has received letters from England", etc., etc.[43] Again, on December 27 of the same year, Mendoza wrote: "In order not to lose Julius I will myself run the risk of going to his house at night."[44] This can mean nothing else than that Julio was living in Paris at the end of the year 1587. Again, in the following July, Mendoza wrote: "I have already paid Julio 500 crowns, and . . . . will in a few days hand him the other 500 crowns."[45] Unless we assume that Mendoza was going to reach the 500 crowns across the Channel, Julio was evidently in Paris still. In a word, if some of the evidence in the *Spanish Calendar* supports the conclusion that Julio was in London, some of it leaves no doubt that Julio was in Paris. It may conceivably be held that this mysterious person was, at different times, on different sides of the Channel, but, if so, it is rather surprising that Mendoza makes no mention whatever of his comings and goings.[46]

[41] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, p. 139.

[42] *Ibid.*, pp. 133–134.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 162.

[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 182–183.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 352.

[46] There appears to be no absolute conflict of dates. Julio, by Mendoza's showing, was in London June 16, 1587, and January 21, February 7, April 20, and July 29, 1588 (*Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, pp. 118, 198, 213, 278, 366).

Yet, had Mendoza been quite consistent in representing Julio as a correspondent in England, it would still be conceivable that Julio and Stafford were identical. In any case Professor Pollard's assertion that Julio's pretended residence in England disposes of the possibility of his being Stafford can hardly be regarded as conclusive.

Whoever Julio really was, it must be borne in mind that he was supplying to the Spanish ambassador exactly the same sort of information that Stafford, in the guise of the "new friend" and the "new confidant", had supplied. This was so manifestly the case that Philip II. of Spain, when he first heard of Julio, at once jumped to the conclusion that he must be Stafford under a new name. This fact in itself establishes a strong presumption in favor of the identity of the two men, and the presumption is strengthened by the many attributes which they had in common. Julio, whoever he was, was certainly in the employ of the English government in a position of great importance and great trust.[47] On one occasion he boasted that he could prevent the queen from levying German soldiers to assist the French Huguenots.[48] Burghley and Walsingham both corresponded with him and revealed to him directly important state secrets;[49] but he evidently regarded Walsingham as his enemy.[50] He was also on intimate terms with the Lord Admiral Howard.[51] He was in a position to get very accurate information about the despatches sent to and from the English ambassador at Paris. Finally, he was deep in debt.[52]

It will be remarked that all of these things are equally true of Stafford. He also was in the employ of the English government in a position of great importance and great trust. He, more than any one else except perhaps a privy councillor, was in a position to influence Elizabeth's policy towards the Huguenots. He corresponded regularly with both Burghley and Walsingham and believed Walsingham to be his enemy. He was the brother-in-law of Lord Admiral Howard. None knew better than he the contents of the French despatches. There is also ample proof of his debts; he himself confessed to Burghley that they were very great.[53]

and in Paris, November 18, and December 27, 1587, and July 24, 1588 (*ibid.*, pp. 162, 183, 352).

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 310, 320.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 197.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 134, 189, 198, 213, 230, 278.

[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 149, 173.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[52] *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 190, 310, 320.

[53] Stafford to Burghley, November 6, 1586: "For their whisperings that I should be in great debt and that by unmeasurable playing, it is very true that I am in great debt . . . but the cause of it is . . . the manner of living I have lived here, the extreme dearth of the time and the extraordinary charges." St. P. France, vol. XVI., f. 139.

Upon this last point Professor Pollard raises particular objection. Mendoza wrote to Philip II. on one occasion that Julio was in arrears in his account with the queen 15,000 crowns. Professor Pollard declares this "a fact which alone would dispose of the idea that he was an ambassador". Exactly why an ambassador should not be in debt to the queen Professor Pollard does not state. And there is evidence to prove that Stafford was behind in his accounts with the queen. Mendoza wrote to Philip on October 2, 1587:

> Julius also informs me that the 12,000 crowns now in the ambassador's hands, out of the 100,000 sent to him by the Queen to give to Béarn [Navarre] and others, are to be employed expressly in aiding the prince of Conti and Count Soissons. But, as the ambassador is overwhelmed with debt, he has spent the money. . . . Julius says that the reason why Walsingham has urged that the ambassador should be ordered to give Soissons these 12,000 crowns is that the Queen should discover that he had spent them, and so he might be disgraced.[54]

Here obviously, if Mendoza was accurately informed, was a situation which might well have placed Stafford several thousand crowns in arrears to the queen. The question at once arises as to whether Mendoza was, or was not, well informed. Upon this particular point, fortunately, there is confirmatory evidence in the English State Papers. On September 12, 1587, Walsingham wrote to Burghley: "Your Lordship, by the enclosed from Mr. Stafford, may perceive how much there remaineth in his hands of the 18,000 crowns which I wish were delivered to the Count of Soissons in case he continue in his former resolution to join with the king of Navarre."[55]

This proves at least that certain money was in Stafford's charge and that Walsingham was urging its delivery to Soissons. It does not, however, prove that Stafford had already spent the money. Upon this point a letter from Stafford to Burghley of March 31, 1588, is more illuminating:

> If *Walsingham,* upon that which I writ to him, as I writ to you once, had showed me as much friendship as by others he professed to me, I might come out of this; for, as I writ to your Lordship, I desired him to be a means only that that which remaineth here might not be called upon that I might serve my turn of it till I came home; for I know there are a great many that have deserved, in my conscience, a great deal less than I, have had greater favors. But he writ to me he durst not speak to her Majesty about it and that was all the answer he made me, which was not that which I desired at his hands; for I desired him not to speak to her Majesty of it, knowing what choler any such demands moveth her to, though men do deserve never so well; and if he had been disposed to do me pleasure, without any such demand at her

[54] *Cal. St. P. Spanish,* 1587–1603, p. 149.

[55] Harleian MSS. 6994, f. 96.

Majesty's hands, he might have purchased the favor not to have that thought upon, and if I might have that favor I would find means to content everybody.[56]

The wording of this letter is obscure but the meaning of it appears to be that Stafford had requested Walsingham to contrive that the money (probably that destined for Soissons which had never been paid over to him) should not be called for in England until Stafford's return home. Apparently all he wanted Walsingham to do was to keep quiet on the subject so that the queen might forget about the money.

The matter is mentioned once again in the English correspondence in a letter from Walsingham to Stafford, dated December 10, 1588: "Her Majesty spoke to me about the 20,000 crowns and blamed me that I had not taken order with you for its return home. I answered I knew not what need she might have to use them there for some special service, wherewith she was satisfied."

Walsingham added that he wished "some way might be devised to content her Majesty in that matter".[57]

Here, then, is pretty strong evidence that Stafford was misappropriating public funds as Mendoza said he was and conclusive proof that he was behind in his accounts with the queen at least 15,000 crowns. So Professor Pollard is quite unjustified in saying that the fact that Julio was behind in his accounts with the queen disposes of the idea that he was Stafford. Quite the contrary, it tends to confirm that idea.

But Mendoza's correspondence furnishes even more convincing evidence of the identity of the two men. On December 19, 1587, he wrote to his master that in consequence of Arundel's death the "new confidant" had requested him to find some other person of trust to convey intelligence between them and added the sentence, already quoted in another connection: "In order not to lose Julio, I will myself run the risk of going to his house at night until I can find a suitable person."[58]

Here evidently the "new confidant", that is to say Stafford, and Julio were one and the same person. Their identity is further borne out by two of Mendoza's letters to Philip of January, 1588. On the 8th of the month Mendoza wrote:

> I was obliged to see the new confidant, and he has again pressed me to lay before your Majesty the necessity in which he finds himself in consequence of his allowances being detained by his enemies. . . . I am

[56] St. P. France, vol. XVIII., f. 103. Walsingham's name is in cipher.

[57] Cotton MSS., Galba E vi, f. 394.

[58] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, pp. 182–183.

putting him off, but if he presses me again about it I have determined to seek the money for him. . . . I have also in view that it is nearly a year ago since your Majesty granted him the 2000 crowns.[59]

The granting of these 2000 crowns by Philip to Stafford has already been alluded to and the identity between Stafford and the "new confidant" in that particular transaction established. On January 9, Mendoza wrote again: "I have decided to do with Julius, as you will see by my despatches, as I think it advisable, so as not to lose him and to keep him in a good humour. It is nearly a year since we gave him the 2000 crowns."[60]

Here the identity of Stafford and Julius is past question. In fact, a careful examination of all the available evidence leaves little or no room for doubt that Julius or Julio and Stafford were one and the same person.

Stafford then, in the various guises of "new friend", "new confidant", Julius and Julio, was evidently supplying the Spanish ambassador in Paris regularly with news of English and French affairs. The question still remains whether the news supplied was of a sort to betray English interests and to make him out a traitor or whether it consisted simply of unimportant matters, disclosed perhaps for the purpose of winning Mendoza's confidence and of securing in return important information which might be serviceable to his mistress. It is conceivable that Stafford may have been posing as a traitor to Mendoza in order to betray Mendoza in turn. This is the explanation of his conduct which Stafford himself was probably prepared to offer and this is the one which Professor Pollard seems disposed to accept.

But the briefest consideration of the information which Stafford regularly supplied to Mendoza effectually disposes of this interpretation of his conduct. Since the midsummer of 1585, Spain and England had been virtually at war. When Stafford began his dealings with Mendoza in the early spring of 1587 Sir Francis Drake was being prepared with the greatest secrecy for his famous expedition to singe King Philip's beard.[61] Almost the first information with which Stafford supplied Mendoza was as to the plans for this expedition and subsequently he kept Mendoza constantly informed of Drake's movements, of the number of his ships, their crews, their armaments, and their probable destination.[62] Again in the following year, when Elizabeth proposed to despatch Drake to the Spanish

[59] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, pp. 189–190.
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 192.
[61] Corbett, *The Spanish War*, pp. xvii–xviii (Navy Records Society).
[62] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, pp. 8, 27, 69, 72, 87.

coast once more, Stafford betrayed the fact to Mendoza.[63] When Elizabeth changed her plans and detained Drake, Mendoza knew of that through Stafford also.[64] When once again, in March, Drake was ordered to take the offensive, Stafford once more made Mendoza aware of it.[65] And later, in June, 1588, when the Spanish Armada had already made its first start for England, Stafford supplied the Spaniard with precise news of the movements of Howard's and Drake's fleets.[66] If this was not the rankest sort of treason, nothing is.[67]

Other evidences of Stafford's double-dealing might be cited as well. For example, he betrayed to Mendoza every particular of the efforts of Elizabeth to form an alliance with Henry III. of France against Spain in the spring of 1588.[68] But enough has already been said to establish the fact of Stafford's treachery. The motives which induced it can only be guessed at. In part they were probably pecuniary ones.[69] Stafford was deep in debt and needed money. He had misappropriated public funds and the queen was demanding an account of them. His creditors in France and England were both pressing him and apparently his salary was being withheld in England in order to satisfy their demands.[70] Altogether he appears to have got from Mendoza 2700 crowns, which was little enough for the services performed.[71] How much he got from the Duke of Guise it is impossible to say. Another motive which prompted him was his antagonism to Walsingham and Leicester and their projects. Elizabeth's hostility to Spain and her interest in the Huguenot cause were both largely due to their instigation. Stafford disapproved of both policies and his desire to thwart them was further stimulated by his desire to thwart their promoters. It may be that he regarded

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 193–194; Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, II. 119.

[64] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, pp. 197, 213.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 230; Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, II. 129.

[66] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, p. 319.

[67] On the other hand, Stafford apparently tried to convince the English government, in the spring of 1588, that Philip had abandoned his intention of sending the Armada. Howard wrote to Walsingham on January 24, 1587/8: "I cannot tell what to think of my brother Stafford's advertisement, for if it be true that the King of Spain's forces be dissolved, I would not wish the Queen's Majesty to be at this charges that she is at; but if it be but a device, knowing that a little thing maketh us too careless, then I know not what may come of it." *Defeat of the Span. Armada*, I. 46 (Navy Records Society).

[68] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, pp. 86–88, 149, 173, 197, 214, 223, 261.

[69] This was the chief motive which Mendoza ascribed to him. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 189, 310, 320.

[71] This is all that Mendoza indicates that he paid Stafford (*cf. ibid.*, pp. 74, 352, 490). Philip II. evidently authorized Mendoza to pay over 4000 crowns altogether (*ibid.*, 196) but, apparently, it was not all paid.

both the Spanish and the French wars as Walsingham's and Leicester's affairs, not the queen's, and was not altogether conscious of treachery to his sovereign in betraying the plans of his personal enemies. His hatred of Navarre, who had hinted to Elizabeth of his treachery, no doubt furnished him with another motive as well.[72] Finally, it is not unlikely that Stafford had an eye to his own fortunes in the event of the queen's death. After Mary Stuart's execution he announced his belief that Philip II. had the best title to the English succession.[73] Possibly he expected that Elizabeth would not live much longer and that Philip would make good his claims. He told Mendoza on one occasion that if the queen "disappeared" many of the principal people in England would rally to Philip's support.[74] On another occasion he offered to secure for himself the viceroyalty of Ireland and to hand over the island to Philip when Elizabeth "disappears".[75] All these look like bids for the favor of a future sovereign. It is worth noticing that after the failure of the Armada his interest in Spain flagged. Mendoza discovered that he was supplying false news and finally, before the close of the year 1588, abandoned hope of getting any more out of him.[76]

How much was known in England about his treachery it is difficult to say. Walsingham knew about it certainly and probably Leicester also. The surprising thing about the whole situation is that in view of Walsingham's knowledge, Stafford was allowed to keep his place. The probable explanation of this fact lies in the character of Walsingham's informants. The testimony of disreputable fellows like Rogers and Gifford could hardly have carried weight against a man of Stafford's birth and connections. Walsingham therefore may have found it advisable not to risk a public exposure. Elizabeth herself revealed no signs of a distrust of Stafford. He returned to England in the spring of 1589[77] but was sent back to France in the autumn of the same year on a mission to Henry of Navarre. His diplomatic career seems to have terminated upon his return to England late in the year 1590, though he was not supplanted as ambassador to France until the following July. The sentiment at the

[72] *Cal. St. P. Spanish*, 1587–1603, p. 7.

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

[76] *Ibid.*, pp. 430, 468, 477, 501.

[77] Professor Pollard, in his article on Stafford in the *Dict. of Nat. Biography*, intimates that Stafford remained in France until October, 1589, but it is clear that he left in the spring of that year. He announced his arrival in England to Walsingham in a letter from Dartmouth dated April 8, 1589. St. P. France, vol. XIX., f. 103.

English court was probably more favorable to his fortunes at this time than it had been, since his two powerful enemies, Leicester and Walsingham, were both dead. There was some talk of making him Walsingham's successor as principal secretary but the matter fell through and Elizabeth eventually appointed Burghley's son, Sir Robert Cecil, instead. Stafford, indeed, never did occupy any position of significance under the queen after his return from France, a fact which may possibly be interpreted to mean that either she or Burghley distrusted him. At the time of his death, in 1605, there were no apparent smirches on his reputation.

CONYERS READ.

A PORTRAIT OF GENERAL GEORGE GORDON MEADE

THE name of George Gordon Meade will always be a prominent one in American history. Every American knows that Meade commanded at Gettysburg and that if Gettysburg did not end the war, it at least checked Lee and his victorious army in the full march of triumph so decisively that they never again ventured on vigorous offensive action.

Also, the circumstances of Meade's leadership at Gettysburg much increase his claim to admiration and gratitude. To take a beaten army from a beaten commander and at three days' notice win a victory over troops like Lee's under a general like Lee was a task that demanded most distinguished qualities of soldiership. This task was imposed upon Meade against his wish; but he accepted it and showed courage and character and brains thoroughly adequate to the occasion.

Yet he remains one of the secondary figures of the war. Men remember anecdotes and phrases and experiences of Grant and Sherman and Sheridan. Of Meade they know nothing but the name. Though nominally in command of the Army of the Potomac until the end, at the great historic scene of Appomattox he was not even present. As a person he is hazy, obscure, hardly distinguished from the multitude. It is of extreme interest to study the causes of this neglect in the nature of the man; and the delightful material now supplied in abundance by the general's recently published *Life and Letters* makes such a study as easy as it is profitable.

The course of Meade's whole biography is clearly elucidated in this ample chronicle, his faithful effort at West Point, where he was graduated in 1834, at the age of nineteen, his patient labor in his vocation of engineering, his creditable service in the Mexican War, his steady advance in the Army of the Potomac until he reached its leadership, and the eclipse of that leadership under Grant during the last year of the war. Meade's admirable letters, chiefly addressed to his wife, reflect all his daily experience, his triumphs and successes as well as failure and discouragement and disappointment.

The careful examination of these records, in connection with other testimony, shows many qualities that were calculated to lead to success. In the first place there was a sane and healthy desire

for it. It is evident that Meade, like other normal men, longed passionately to get on in the profession he had adopted. "In military matters, as in all things else", he says, "success is the grand criterion by which men are judged."[1] When he feels that he has chosen the wrong path and has missed some golden opportunity, his regret is bitter: "I tremble sometimes when I think what I might have been, and remember what I am, when I reflect on what I might have accomplished if I had devoted all my time and energies to one object, an object where my exertions would have told in my advancement."[2] On the eve of a great battle he inspires himself with the thought of what victory will bring: "I go into the action to-day as the commander of an army corps. If I survive, my *two* stars are secure, and if I fall, you will have my reputation to live on."[3] And he has a clear and sober consciousness of having deserved such promotion as is likely to come to him. "If most faithful attention to those duties for nearly a year preceding, and activity and energy such as (though I say it myself) have attracted attention from various officers, entitle me to the advancement of one grade . . . then I can safely appeal to my brother-officers for my credentials in this case."[4]

And the natural corollary of ambition, sensitiveness at being unduly postponed to others, is by no means wanting. A great clamor was raised before Antietam over Reynolds's removal, which put Meade in Reynolds's place. Meade, thereupon, hotly protested that the urgency to have Reynolds back was a slight to him and that if Reynolds came he should insist on being relieved.[5] The analysis of Meade's state of mind during the last year of the war, when Grant and Sheridan were crowding him out of public notice, is of extreme interest. Recognizing always, with inherent magnanimity, the fine qualities of both generals, never uttering one word of public protest, he yet shows clearly to his intimate correspondent the keen susceptibility he cannot overcome. "You may look now for the Army of the Potomac putting laurels on the brows of another rather than your husband."[6] When at last, after the war, the supreme military honor is awarded to Sheridan instead of to himself, his sense of justice revolts in language which shows how deep was the disappointment. "My own sweet love, you can imagine the

[1] *Life*, I. 99.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 40–41.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 311.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 128.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 310.
[6] *Ibid.*, II. 178.

force of this blow, but . . . we must find consolation in the consciousness . . . that it is the cruelest and meanest act of injustice, and the hope, if there is any sense of wrong or justice in the country, that the man who perpetrated it will some day be made to feel so."[7]

On the other hand, what is most winning about Meade's ambition and desire for success is the moderation and perfect candor that temper it. Cheap notoriety, the current advertising of the newspapers, he detests and will make no effort to obtain it or cater to it. Hasty promotion, reward beyond his deserts, he does not desire, rather deprecates it, as bringing later mortification and regret. Even when things seem to be going against him, he recognizes that it is the fortune of war. "I don't mean to say I have not been badly treated, but I do mean to say I might have been much worse treated, and that my present *status* is not without advantages, and does not justify my being discontented."[8] What could be finer than his attitude on the first advent of Grant? "I believe Grant is honest and fair, and I have no doubt he will give me full credit for anything I may do, and if I don't deserve any, I don't desire it."[9] While no man ever expressed personal ambition more finely than this quiet soldier in the early days of his campaigning, "I hope the people of the country will appreciate what we have done, and for myself individually, if I get the approbation of those in whose hearts I wish to live, it is all that I ask."[10]

Also, Meade had other qualities that make for greatness more substantially than the mere desire to attain it. He had everywhere and always the deepest sense of duty. When there was work to be done, he was ready to do it, no matter how unsavory or distasteful. Grant bears witness to his subordinate's unfailing earnestness and he adds further that Meade was able to take the plan of another, even when he did not approve of it, and carry it out as zealously as if it were his own. Those who have made some study of the history of the war, North and South, will appreciate how rare a quality this was.

And with the instinct of duty went that of sacrifice. The general would sacrifice private feelings. Even when his child was dying, he would not leave his post. He would sacrifice public advancement. "Sedgwick and Meade", says Grant, "were men so finely formed that if ordered to resign their general's commissions and take service as corporals, they would have fallen into the ranks

[7] *Life*, II. 300.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 234.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 183.
[10] *Ibid.*, I. 140.

without a murmur."[11] And he goes on to relate how Meade came to him, when he arrived in the East, and offered to give up his position to any other officer that Grant might prefer.

How deeply this instinct of duty and sacrifice was founded in patriotism is understood when we read what Meade has to say about his failure to attack Lee after Gettysburg and again at Mine Run. His military judgment may have been at fault in one or both of these cases, but at least his determination not to be driven from what he thought right by any storm of popular clamor is forever admirable and to be imitated. His own expression of this is so fine that I quote it at length: "It will be proved as clear as the light of day, that an attack was perfectly practicable, and that every one, except myself, in the army, particularly the soldiers, was dying for it, and that I had some mysterious object in view, either in connection with politics, or stock-jobbing, or something else about as foreign to my thoughts, and finally the Administration will be obliged to yield to popular clamor and discard me. For all this I am prepared, fortified as I said before by a clear conscience, and the conviction that I have acted from a high sense of duty, to myself as a soldier, to my men as their general, and to my country and its cause . . . having its vital interests solemnly entrusted to me, which I have no right wantonly to play with and to jeopardize either for my own personal benefit, or to satisfy the demands of popular clamor, or interested politicians."[12]

In addition to these qualities of moral character, which are certainly helpful to greatness, Meade had intelligence of the highest order. His mind was perhaps not so vividly and restlessly active as Sherman's; but it was far more tranquil and far better balanced. It was perfectly capable of sympathy with all sides and with all interests of life. Though his early and constant preoccupation with practical matters left him little time for purely intellectual pursuits, it is evident that he turned to such pursuits by natural instinct. In one of his letters he expresses deep regret at being cut off from the enjoyment of music. In another he shows genuine literary sense by his criticism of the detestable jingle of *Lucile,* then running its brief course of popularity.

In everything relating to the practical affairs of life, the calm lucidity, the broad balance of Meade's intellect make themselves constantly and gratefully felt. When vigor and decision are needed, he is always ready for them. There is no doubt or questioning when doubt and questioning are out of place. Thus, though he dis-

[11] J. R. Young, *Around the World with General Grant,* II. 299.
[12] *Life,* II. 158–159.

approved totally of the Mexican War from a political point of view, he felt that, once in, we should prosecute it with all the energy of which the nation was capable. "Let us show a bold and united front, forget *party* for an instant; now that we are in the war, prosecute it with all possible vigor, not in talk but in acts . . . let [Mexico] see we are determined to carry everything before us; and you may rest assured that if she is ever going to make peace, she will do it then, and not till then."[13] Yet this zeal and efficiency in action are always tempered by a really remarkable power of rising above the immediate present, of seeing things in their larger aspects and their manifold phases, of recognizing the good intention and earnest purpose of an adversary, even when you are opposing him with all your might. No man fought the war with steadier conviction than Meade. But no man showed a larger or more sympathetic tolerance and charity before the war and during it and after it.

So in military matters, what distinguishes Meade above everything else and gives him his lasting claim to respect, is brains. It may be remarked that this was the claim of Von Moltke, also, who is considered to have been something of a general. It was not that Meade had a vivid and fertile imagination, but he saw possibilities, weighed them, and adopted or rejected them on all their merits. He was "not original in devising brilliant plans", says Colonel W. R. Livermore, "but his clear understanding enabled him to discriminate between the plans of others."[14]

Of course intelligence, in excess, has its grave military dangers. It is not always well to see all the possibilities too clearly. Meade himself, with that gift we all have of sooner or later defining ourselves, says somewhere, "I am a *juste milieu* man."[15] Now a *juste milieu* man, one who keeps the middle of the travelled road, sometimes balances too well, sometimes errs by excess of caution, sometimes hesitates to take the chances which one blinder or less far-seeing would take in ignorance and come out with dazzling triumph. It was this weakness, if it was a weakness, which induced Meade to provide for the possibility of retreat from Gettysburg and kept him from attacking after the battle, this which prevented him from pursuing Lee with the headlong vigor which the nation thirsted for, this which brought upon him the reproach of Halleck and the pleading of Lincoln. "If General Meade can now attack him [Lee] on a field no more than equal for us", wrote the President, "and will

[13] *Life*, I. 181.
[14] *Story of the Civil War*, III. 495.
[15] *Life*, I. 162.

do so with all the skill and courage which he, his officers, and men possess, the honor will be his, if he succeeds, and the blame may be mine, if he fails."[16]

To this appeal Meade answered, "It has been my intention to attack the enemy, if I can find him on a field no more than equal for us, and that I have only delayed doing so from the difficulty of ascertaining his exact position, and the fear that in endeavoring to do so my communications might be jeopardized."[17] It may be that too keen intelligence in the apprehension of possibilities here did the general an injury, but, I repeat, he at least showed splendid courage in acting on his own judgment alone and not surrendering it to any pressure from others.

Also, there are those who believe that that judgment was usually correct, and who agree with General Hunt as to Gettysburg in particular, "He was right in his orders as to Pipe Creek; right, in his determination under certain circumstances to fall back to it; right, in pushing up to Gettysburg after the battle; right, in remaining there; right, in not attempting to counter-attack at any stage of the battle; right, as to his pursuit of Lee."[18] It may be added that it has never yet been shown and perhaps never can be shown that, if Meade had been supported as Grant was and supplied as Grant was, he would not have accomplished quite as much as Grant.

What is most of all attractive about Meade's intellectual make-up is his absolute candor. There is no bluff, no swagger, no pretension, no attempt to throw dust in the eyes of posterity. He debates and analyzes his own mistakes just as freely and frankly as he would those of another. And when one has read thousands of pages of self-justification by great commanders on both sides, one appreciates how rare such candor is. Take this admirable passage from the official report of the Mine Run campaign, in which the general discusses the arguments for and against his own conduct as calmly and earnestly as if he were pleading in the naked, quiet chamber of his conscience. "It may be said I should not depend on the judgment of others, but it is impossible a commanding general can reconnoiter in person a line of over 7 miles in extent, and act on his own judgment as to the expediency of attacking or not. Again, it may be said that the effort should have been made to test the value of my judgment, or, in other words, that I should encounter what I believed to be certain defeat, so as to prove conclusively that victory was impossible . . . . Considering how sacred is the trust of

[16] *Official Records*, series I., vol. 29, pt. II., p. 332.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 333.

[18] Quoted by Walker in *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, III. 412.

the lives of the brave men under my command, but willing as I am to shed their blood and my own where duty requires, and my judgment dictates that the sacrifice will not be in vain, I cannot be a party to a wanton slaughter of my troops for any mere personal end."[19]

With these great moral and intellectual qualities, which should have ensured success and glory, Meade unfortunately combined some others that were less helpful. The latter were not in themselves all positive defects, indeed very much the contrary. Some of them were the most charming elements in the general's character and remind one forcibly of the words of Shakespeare,

> "To some kind of men
> Their graces serve them but as enemies."

For instance, all through Meade's career we find a singular modesty, almost amounting to self-distrust, and this is a trait so rare in Civil War history, as to attract attention and admiration at once. I have now spent fifteen years in the study of these practical natures who did things, either in war or statesmanship, and I begin positively to thirst for spirits of another type. The achievement of great matters brings out splendid qualities, keen insight, quick decision, the neglect of slight things for what is truly essential. But it also develops and necessarily requires a self-confidence which, repeated in a thousand various phases, becomes intolerably wearisome. The highest order of genius, Lincoln's or Lee's, can do things without this self-assurance; but in greater or less degree it is apt to permeate practical minds of a narrower type.

Now Meade was as modest as Lincoln or Lee, and in his position undue modesty kept him out of the public view and gave others much less deserving a chance to elbow past him in the race for honor.

Not that Meade was without a proper pride and just sense of the value of his ability and achievements. In the midst of later disappointment and discouragement, his heart thrills when he thinks of Gettysburg. Even his enemies, he says, acknowledge that Gettysburg was one of the greatest victories the world has ever seen, though some of them believe it would have been greater if he had not been there. And he frankly declares that, "As I reflect on that eventful period, and all that has elapsed since, I have reason to be satisfied with my course, and cause to be most thankful. The longer this war continues the more will Gettysburg and its results be appreciated."[20]

[19] *Official Records*, series I., vol. 29, pt. I., p. 18.
[20] *Life*, II. 210.

Nor was he inclined to underrate himself as compared with others. He playfully deprecates his wife's enthusiasm, declaring that he is no more than a common soldier doing his duty; yet lest she should take him too closely at his word, he adds with just and manly dignity, "One thing, however, I am willing to admit, and that is, that I consider myself as good as most of my neighbors and without great vanity may say that I believe myself to be better than some who are much higher."

But no man was more ready to admit his own deficiencies. As we have seen above, when he failed he did not waste a moment forging excuses or unloading blame on to others. He went right straight to the causes of failure and if he found them in himself, he said so. When he receives honorable mention, he notes that there is a great deal of accident about it and that many who missed it have done quite as much as he. When he is put forward prominently as the victor of Gettysburg, he points out that chance has its mighty share in all great victories and that he had better abstain from bragging until his future is more secure. And I have met with few commanders on either side who could have penned the simple sentence in which he recounts one of his adventures with Lee. "This was a deep game, and I am free to admit that in the playing of it he has got the advantage of me."[21]

Finest of all, as illustrating this natural instinct of self-distrust, is Meade's shrinking from supreme command. Everywhere one finds men hurt and injured, because not entrusted with positions equal to their merits; but the instances of those who had rank enough and feared more are rare indeed. Meade was certainly one of them. It is not only that he balked when the command of the Army of the Potomac was actually thrust upon him. The boldest might have done that under the circumstances. But months before he writes to his wife in the most intimate frankness of self-confession: "Your anxiety lest I should be placed in command of the army causes me to smile. Still, I must confess when such men as Gibbon say it is talked about, it really does look serious and alarming; yet, when I look back on the good fortune which has thus far attended my career, I cannot believe so sudden a change for the worse can occur as would happen if I were placed in command."[22] The absolute sincerity of this cannot be questioned and to turn to it from the loud petulance of so many who are eager to better themselves is like stepping from the clatter of cities into the quiet of green fields.

And as he was too modest to thrust himself into the glare of

[21] *Ibid.*, II. 154.
[22] *Ibid.*, I. 351.

glory, so Meade had another grace inimical to the greatest success of a soldier; he was a lover of peace. It is worth noting that none of the men of the very first rank on either side in the war were of the roaring, swashbuckler type, which prates about the pleasure of fighting in itself. Grant and Thomas, Lee and the two Johnstons, were quiet gentlemen. Sherman was certainly not quiet, but he was anything but a boisterous roarer. And so far Meade is in excellent company. But he differed from all these I have named in that he took little or no pleasure in his profession, in fact found it positively distasteful in all its aspects. "He was not a soldier by instinct",[23] says Colonel W. R. Livermore, and only repeats what Meade was constantly saying himself.

Understand me. I do not for a moment suggest anything so absurd as that Meade was lacking in personal courage. He had probably as high moral control over any physical timidity as a man of such sensitive temperament ever possessed. Splendid anecdotes are told of his coolness in action and by some who were not favorable to him. Read Butterfield's account of his sitting quietly at the crisis of Gettysburg, with the shells bursting all about him, telling stories to the young officers of his early adventures and experiences. "The world might naturally suppose that with the immense responsibility so suddenly placed upon him unsought and unexpected, Meade might have been a trifle nervous or excited. If he was, he never betrayed it."[24] Read, again, Horace Porter's description of the general in battle, his sharp, ringing orders, his intense energy of carriage and movement, his quick comprehension of the conduct of all his subordinates and intelligent adjustment of their action to each other.

Yet, if you examine his heart carefully, as it is laid bare in the long process of his correspondence, you will agree with Colonel Livermore that he was not a soldier by instinct. Why, even at the beginning he went to West Point as it were by accident and against his inclination. He had none of the drum-and-fife fever which makes so many boys soldiers before they know it. He was a thinker, a scholar. The drill at the Academy, the endless repetition of technique, indispensable but monotonous, bored him unspeakably. He longed to be out of the army before he was fairly in it. Years later, in Mexico, he enlarges with energetic disgust on the same tedious features of actual military life. "A camp where is no active service is a dull and stupid place, nothing but drill and parades, and your ears are filled all day with drumming and fifeing. All this is very

[23] *Story of the Civil War*, III. 495.

[24] Julia Lorrilard Butterfield, *Memorial of General Daniel Butterfield*, p. 128.

pretty for such as have never seen it, but fifteen years of such business takes off the edge of novelty."[25]

He was delicate in health, too, and the hardships of camp life were a trial to him. He bore them without complaint, but he grew infinitely tired of them. "Do not be frightened about me, but the sight of two gentlemen so sick, with no friendly hand near them, no accommodation of any kind whatever in a flimsy tent, made me feel badly, not only for them, but for myself, in anticipation of being similarly situated. Still, I trust I shall keep well, and if taking care of myself will do it, I am certain of it." He does not seem much exhilarated with the enthusiasm of a soldier's career, does he? And in Mexico, where this was written, in the prime of strength and vigor, he grows so homesick, so stricken with longing for home and the presence of those he loves, that he is only prevented from resigning by the thought that honor will not allow him to do so in the face of approaching conflict.

Honor only, you observe; for all the excitement, all the inspiration, which so many soldiers feel in actual battle, was apparently omitted from Meade's composition. The fighting fury of Jackson and Sheridan and Stuart, the intoxication which even Lee indicated when he said, "It is well that this is so terrible, or else we might grow fond of it",[26] seem utterly foreign to this quiet scholar who fought as he did problems in arithmetic. There was little spirit of adventure in the man who wrote, "Before Colonel Cross's death it was usual for the officers to ride in all directions, hunting and for exercise, but I never went more than two miles, always with a party, and always on open ground, where I had a fair view of every thing around me."[27] Falkland, whom Meade in some points resembles, could not, in Clarendon's strange phrase, *ingeminate* "Peace! Peace!" with a more thirsty longing than did Meade at an early period in the war. "Peace—oh, what a glorious word, and how sweet and delightful would its realization be to me!"[28] And one sentence sums up this whole attitude of mind with conclusive emphasis. "I like fighting as little as any man."[29] You will agree, I think, that this is a singular utterance for a great soldier.

Besides these attractive qualities, modesty and the love of peace, which unfitted him for popular military success, Meade had one positive defect, and that was his inability to win men. He had a few

[25] *Life*, I. 35.
[26] J. W. Jones, *Life and Letters of General Robert E. Lee*, p. 208.
[27] *Life*, I. 67.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 317.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 349.

warm friends, he had the esteem of many; but his officers generally did not love him, even when they trusted him, and he had no faculty whatever of inspiring an army with that personal enthusiasm which, while it may not bring victory without great generalship, is almost essential to give great generalship permanent triumph.

This lack of gift for dealing with his subordinates did not come from insufficient judgment or insight. On the contrary, Meade's calm, clear, just intelligence shows in nothing more than in his fine appreciation of the characters of men. This appears admirably, so far back as the Mexican War, in his comments on his fellow-officers. It shows still better, during the Civil War, in all that he writes of the great number of distinguished soldiers with whom he was brought into contact. His judgments of McClellan, of Burnside, of Hooker, remain perhaps the most illuminating of any that we have, not exempt from severity, where severity is required, but absolutely free from jealousy and inclining to emphasize good qualities wherever possible. This recognition of the good is especially noticeable with Sheridan and Grant, whom Meade had certainly no reason to love, but whom he analyzes with the most kindly and generous discrimination.

It is possible that Meade read men too well to be popular with them. The first lesson of practical life is that to be on good terms with people we must treat them as if we thought a little better of them than we really do. Though Meade was thoroughly democratic in principle, it is not certain that he cared very much about being on good terms with the generality. It is certain that he was not one to disguise the truth for the sake of being on good terms with anybody.

Whatever the reason, he had friction with too many. Perhaps his difficulties with Sickles and Butterfield were natural. They were men of an altogether different stamp from him. But he quarrelled with Warren—and made it up, quarrelled with Sheridan, even with the amiable Burnside, and did not make it up. There were others with whom he did not quarrel, but who simply felt that they would much prefer to serve under somebody else. And this is not a favorable state of mind in war. Little things often indicate great defects. I know nothing that better reveals Meade's tactlessness than General Schaff's excellent account of the general's horse. The animal had one of those gaits which are neither a walk nor a trot and make it impossible for others to keep pace with him—a "fox-walk" General Schaff aptly calls it and adds that members of the staff were often heard to say, "Damn that horse of Meade's! I

wish he would either go faster or slower."[30] I fear that Meade rode through life at something of a fox-walk.

Also, it is pretty substantially proved that under extreme stress his nerves would break in abominable fits of temper. We read of the great Condé, that in ordinary converse he was harsh and rough with his subordinates, but that under fire his manners were restrained into an exquisite courtesy. Just the opposite appears to have been the case with Meade. At the mess and the campfire he treated his staff like a cultured gentleman, but in battle, especially if they brought bad news, he rated them as if they were schoolboys, swore, if need be, and in general so comported himself that no one approached him if it could possibly be avoided. "A battle always put him in a fury", says Grant. "He raged from the beginning to the end. His own staff officers would dread to bring him a report of anything wrong. Meade's anger would overflow on the heads of his nearest and best friends."[31]

Meade's biographers reject evidence of this sort coming from Grant and Grant's followers—for instance, Dana and Horace Porter—as somewhat suspicious. But there are plenty of other witnesses. General Schaff has no prejudice against Meade; yet he, too, writes: "I have seen him so cross and ugly that no one dared to speak to him,—in fact, at such times his staff and everybody else kept as clear of him as possible."[32]

The most reliable written evidence we have of this weakness of Meade's is his savage communication to Burnside at the time of the mine disaster. "Do you mean to say your officers and men will not obey your orders to advance? If not, what is the obstacle? I wish to know the truth and desire an immediate answer."[33] To which Burnside not unnaturally replied: "I have never in any report said anything different from what I conceived to be the truth. Were it not insubordinate I would say that the latter remark of your note was unofficerlike and ungentlemanly."[34] And thus the reply churlish breeds ever the countercheck quarrelsome.

When I read all these things, I turn to Meade's portrait, and begin to understand it. The high intelligence is under the high forehead. The stern brows and eagle nose mark the unquailing courage. There are lines of sensitiveness, lines of possible sympathy. But it is not the face of a man men love.

30 *The Battle of the Wilderness*, p. 42.
31 Young, *Around the World with General Grant*, II. 249.
32 *Battle of the Wilderness*, p. 41.
33 *Official Records*, series I., vol. 40, p. 142.
34 *Ibid.*, p. 143.

A medical officer came to Meade at some not very fortunate moment and complained that the soldiers were calling him "Old Pills" and he wanted it stopped. Meade clapped on his great eyeglasses, glared furiously at the complainant, and snarled, "Well, what of that? How can I prevent it? Why, I hear that, when I rode out the other day, some of the men called me 'a d—d old goggle-eyed snapping turtle.'"[35]

A d—d old goggle-eyed snapping turtle! A man had ever so much rather be called the savior of his country, hadn't he? But these soldiers are so keen-sighted and so abominably frank!

The ill-temper, the irritability, however, were only superficial, only the outcome of overwrought nerves stretched to the point of cracking. Everyone recognizes that after such a crisis the general was most eager and cordial in his expression of regret. Moreover, General Schaff adds that "As the campaign progressed, with its frightful carnage and disappointments, his temper grew fiercer";[36] and this explains not only any apparent inconsistency in the anecdote of coolness at Gettysburg above narrated, but much besides. It reminds us that Meade was working under difficulties that would have strained a far more phlegmatic disposition. After he had held for months the sole command of that magnificent army, the government became dissatisfied and he was suddenly subjected to the control of Grant, a control kindly exercised, but galling, to say the least. If the head of the Army of the Potomac wished to leave his post for a day, he was obliged humbly to beg permission of his superior. Such outbursts of wrath as he poured upon Sheridan are perhaps inexcusable. They are quite explicable when we consider that Sheridan was so supported by the higher authorities, that he had the impudence to speak to his nominal commander in the following fashion. "I told him that since he insisted on giving the cavalry directions without consulting or even notifying me, he could henceforth command the Cavalry Corps himself—that I would not give it another order."[37] For such a reply in any European army the impetuous Irishman would have run considerable risk of being shot.

Through all these immense difficulties, in spite of superficial irritation, Meade bore himself with a fundamental patience and dignity which we cannot fail to admire. Again and again he declares his humble, earnest wish to do his duty and his utter disregard of personal advantage. No finer letter was written during the war than that in which he expresses to Halleck his willingness

[35] Horace Porter, *Campaigning with Grant*, p. 248.

[36] *Battle of the Wilderness*, p. 40.

[37] *Personal Memoirs of General Philip Sheridan*, I. 368.

to be treated as a mere instrument for the welfare of the cause all were desirous to serve. "I take this occasion to say to you, and through you to the President, that I have no pretensions to any superior capacity for the post he has assigned me to; that all I can do is to exert my utmost efforts and do the best I can; but that the moment those who have a right to judge my actions think, or feel satisfied, either that I am wanting or that another would do better, that moment I earnestly desire to be relieved, not on my own account, but on account of the country and the cause."[38]

So we return to what is attractive about Meade, to what is charming; for however unapproachable he may have been in official relations, no one can read his letters without being drawn to him, without feeling a singular attachment for one so simple, so large-hearted, so sincere. It is very curious that you might study the biography carefully without getting the least intimation of faults of temper, and this seems to indicate that these faults were somewhat less radical than many would have us believe. The only hint of anything of the kind is the sharp scene with a newspaper man, where temper was surely justified, if ever. "I asked his authority; he said it was the talk of the camp. I told him it was a base and wicked lie, and that I would make an example of him, which should not only serve to deter others from committing like offenses, but would give publicity to his lie and the truth."[39] And he ordered the offender paraded through the army, with a placard stating that he was a "Libeler of the Press".

On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence that in general social intercourse Meade could be very attractive. His broad and trained intelligence made his conversation full of interest. His manners were easy and courteous. And General Schaff emphasizes the peculiarly sensitive, refined, and sympathetic quality of his voice.

But it is in his family relations that the general's charm is felt most. His letters to his wife have not one atom of sentimentality, but they have unusual tenderness, sympathy, winning warmth of affection. Every detail of his children's growth and education interests him and his longing to be with them is sometimes so great that he is almost ready to forget duty and even honor. "At night, when I thought of seeing you and my dear children . . . I would be almost crazy, and determined the next morning I would go and get my leave."[40] His respect and esteem for his wife show in the habit of referring every question, even those military, to her sym-

[38] *Official Records*, series I., vol. 27, pt. I., p. 109.

[39] *Life*, II. 202–203.

[40] *Ibid.*, I. 38.

pathy and judgment, and his deep devotion expresses itself often in passages like the following: "Do you know, to-day is our wedding-day and my birthday. Twenty-one years ago we pledged our faith to each other, and I doubt if any other couple live who, with all the ups and downs of life, have had more happiness with each other than you and I."[41]

The intimate self-revelation of these domestic letters shows in the writer of them a singular simplicity and single-heartedness, which are quite irresistible. Like many men of great intellectual power, Meade seemed to analyze himself with as perfect frankness as he would have done anyone else. I have already indicated this in regard to military matters, but it is even more attractive as to personal experience. When he is about to be set aside, he notes the fact with entire candor of acceptance. "My time I suppose has passed, and I must now content myself with doing my duty unnoticed."[42] When a great crisis is at hand, he sets down quietly his own fears and tremors: "Sometimes I have a little sinking at the heart, when I reflect that perhaps I may fail at the grand scratch; but I try to console myself with the belief that I shall probably do as well as most of my neighbors, and that your firm faith must be founded on some reasonable groundwork."[43] But the most charming illustration of this personal candor is the general's comment on Reynolds. Few men would let such a remark go beyond their own conscience and many would not be honest enough to admit it even there. "As yet the order has not been issued, but when it comes I shall subside gracefully into a division commander, though frankness compels me to say, I do wish Reynolds had stayed away, and that I could have had a chance to command a corps in action. Perhaps it may yet occur."[44] And again, in a little different connection, "I envied Reynolds when he left for Harrisburg, and secretly thought the Governor might have applied for me."[45] Now that I call a ravishing bit of human nature.

The truth is, Meade could afford to be frank, because he had nothing to conceal. Few men have built their lives upon a broader foundation of dignity, of purity, of courage, of faithful devotion to duty. His religious interests are certainly neither obtrusive nor excessive. But they were evidently very deep, very genuine, and very vital in their influence. At times they become almost

[41] *Life*, I. 241.
[42] *Ibid.*, II. 229.
[43] *Ibid*, I. 219.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 315.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 316.

naïve, as when he inclines to think that his leg was saved by special interposition of the providence of God. But usually there is a grave and solemn earnestness about them which admirably fits the solid, loyal temper of the man. "I thought, too, of how I was preserved then and since in many perilous times through God's mercy and will, and prayed He would continue His gracious protection to me, and in His own good time restore me to you, or if this was not His will, and it was decreed that I was to be summoned, that He would forgive me, for His Son's sake, the infinite number of sins I have all my life been committing."[46]

One bitter sentence, wrung from Meade in the hour of neglect, deserves particular attention. "Don't worry yourself about this; treat it with contempt. It cannot be remedied, and we should be resigned. I don't believe the truth ever will be known, and I have a great contempt for History."[47] This is contrary to what is usually asserted. Most slighted heroes console themselves with the thought that history will set everything right. Will it?

Without going too much into the general question it may surely be maintained that there is always some cause for a great reputation. When a man is lauded by his contemporaries and by posterity, there is some reason for it. What is puzzling, and what seems to justify Meade, is that the cause is so often inadequate to the result. A man may have splendid gifts, gifts of the highest value to the world, and be known only to few, while one who has a fine figure and a tongue and can drink a cocktail cordially may get laurels and a statue. It was something so with Meade. He had a dozen great qualities. But because he had not the faculty of drawing men after him, he must stand not only behind those who had that faculty with others, as Lee and Sherman and Sheridan and Thomas, but even behind those who had that faculty and little else, as Hooker and McClellan.

He was simply the man who fought Gettysburg. After all, History takes note of that.

GAMALIEL BRADFORD.

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 276–277.
[47] *Ibid.*, II. 271.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

[Under this caption it is proposed to print in each number of the REVIEW, hereafter, three or four or five brief contributions in which historical investigators may communicate new discoveries, new criticism of sources, new arguments, new conclusions, or suggestions for further research or thought. It is hoped that the addition, to the "body articles", of this new department or group of briefer communications—peltasts reinforcing the conventional hoplites of research, corvettes supporting the traditional three-deckers—may make the general array more mobile and effective, and may encourage in the historical profession a free and intimate interchange of results and opinions. But it is also hoped that all who favor us with such notes will compose them with great brevity.]

CONCILIUM AND CONSILIUM.

IN the July number of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW a question was raised by Professor A. B. White, in his article on "Concentration of Representatives" and again in his review of *The King's Council,* which it seems to me should not pass without an answer. This is in regard to the terms *concilium* and *consilium,* as used in the thirteenth century, and the ideas suggested by them. It is maintained that "*Consilium* was, in addition to its old meaning of counsel, from the beginning of Henry III.'s reign, used regularly for the smaller assembly, the ancestor of the Privy Council, whereas in nearly every case in which a large assembly of barons was referred to, whether in chronicle or official record, *concilium* was used" (AM. HIST. REV., XIX. 740; also 868). I readily acknowledge the omission of *The King's Council* to treat this point specifically, although the omission was not from ignorance. To present some of the facts in evidence, it is true that in the language of the Church the form *concilium* was as a rule preferred to designate all ecclesiastic assemblies of formal character, whether these were general or local, oecumenical, plenary, provincial, or regional; while *consilium* in addition to its sense of counsel or advice was used in the documents of the Church for secular councils of state and town (see Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum;* Wilkins, *Concilia;* and Du Cange, *Glossarium*). To a noticeable extent the writers of England, in both chronicles and records, were affected by this example and sought to make similar distinctions between councils of state, although the institutions were by no means parallel. Matthew Paris and others refer to the great assemblages summoned by the king in phrases such as *gen-*

erale concilium and *concilium congregatum*; sometimes indeed they bring the two forms into contrast as *per consilium et assensum concilii nostri.* But they give also so many instances clearly to the contrary, to say nothing of expressions of double or ambiguous meaning, that we may reasonably hesitate to accept the statement of a positive rule in this regard. The following examples show that *consilium* was used, interchangeably with *concilium,* to denote the council in its larger and more dignified form, and by some writers was the term preferred. In the authoritative edition of Bracton's *Note Book* I find *generale concilium* given only once; elsewhere it is always *consilium,* even when the council was manifestly great, as when at Merton in 1234–1235 the barons pronounced their *nolumus* against change in the laws of England—*convocato consilio provisum est* (Maitland, no. 1117, etc.). As early as the expression "council in parliament" becomes a current phrase, denoting the king's council in its most expanded form, it appears regularly as *consilium,* not *concilium, in parliamento* (*Rot. Parl.,* I. 15, 125, 150, etc.). The interchangeability of the two forms of the word is shown in the following passage referring to the ecclesiastical council of Lyons in 1274, *de consilio Lugdunensi . . . fuit concilium maximum celebratum* (*Flores Hist.,* III. 33). At the same time with less frequency *concilium* instead of *consilium* was used in the sense of counsel as well as for council in its less formal aspect. More than once Matthew Paris gives the word a double meaning, as for instance, *significarunt cardinales inito prolixiori concilio . . . ut convocaretur concilium generale* (IV. 30, also 372). In the records of the Exchequer we find *concilium ad scaccarium* as well as *consilium ad scaccarium* (*King's Council,* p.41. In the rolls of the *curia regis* there are upon the same membrane *Placita coram Consilio Domini Regis* and *Placita coram W. Ebor' Archiepiscopo et Concilio Domini Regis* (*Abb. Plac.,* p. 118; a reference which I have verified from the roll). Other passages of the kind are *coram ipso domino rege et concilio suo* (*Ann. Burton,* p. 253), *a regali concilio* (*Dunst.,* p. 68), *rege et concilio suo ignorantibus* (*ibid.,* p. 221, also 274).

If it be thought that these are only exceptions which prove the rule, there is still a stronger side of the argument. For if the distinction of *concilium* and *consilium* had been well grounded in the thirteenth century, we should expect the same usage to be carried forward into the fourteenth century, when the existence of two institutions, namely Parliament and the council, was clearly recognized. But instead in all the official records of the latter time the spelling *consilium* gains ground almost to the exclusion of the other. The

Parliament itself, or rather the inchoate House of Lords, among other modes of designation continues to be known as *consilium in parliamento* (*Rot. Parl., passim*; *Ancient Petitions,* etc.). A statute is sanctioned *de consilio praelatorum, comitum et aliorum fidelium regni nostri de consilio nostro existentium* (*Statutes of the Realm,* I. 51). Writs for the summons of barons and knights are issued *de militibus eligendis et mittendis ad consilium, de consilio summoniendo,* etc. (*Parl. Writs,* I. 26, 65). The expression *commune consilium,* which has been cited as suggesting only the process of taking counsel, is shown to mean council as well as counsel in the passage *Rex . . . in pleno parliamento suo et de communi consiliosuo statuit* (*Rot. Parl.,* I. 78); later there is *clericus communis consilii* (*King's Council,* p. 368). On the other hand *concilium* survives in the connection *de concilio Regis iuratus, secretum, concilium,* etc. (*ibid.,* pp. 74, 88, 105). The later records of the council itself, whenever they are in Latin and also when at length English words like "counsellor" and "councillor" appear, fail to bear out the assumption that there was any philological difference between *consilium* and *concilium,* much less that *magnum consilium* of the fourteenth century was an evolution apart from *magnum concilium* of the thirteenth century. When the entire history of the council is held in view, the evidence seems obvious and overwhelming that instead of two words connoting two ideas, which have been taken as forecasting two institutions, we have only variants of the same word employed diversely, it is true, at certain times by individual clerks. One reason why the letter *s* so far superseded the *c* is found in the tendencies of the vertical style of handwriting, which multiplied the upright letters and the upright forms of letters rather than the round letters. It may be noticed incidentally that the round *s* (like a Greek sigma) is not always perfectly distinguished from the *c,* but the Gothic style ran more and more exclusively to the upright *s* (like an *f*).

Finally there is a reason why the clerks of the thirteenth century were unable to separate the two ideas with any degree of clearness. This was because the king's council itself was not as yet defined in respect of its larger form apart from its smaller form. Only for purposes of taxation, according to Magna Carta, art. 14, was it stated that all the barons should be summoned and how they should be summoned. Since the levy of a tax therefore was properly by authority of a general council, it is pertinent to the argument to notice that in regard to the carucage of 1217 it was said *assisum fuit per consilium regni nostri* (*Rot. Lit. Claus.,* I. 348). For other functions there was no standard of size, how large the council should be,

or as to formality, in what manner it should be assembled. Often it was small, but from its narrowest circle it expanded to its widest through every degree of dimensions. Nor can we be sure, as Mr. White says further, "that a council in connection with which a date was named, indicating limited duration, the temporary presence of many magnates, was *concilium*; advice, deliberation, or the counselling body that was in continuous session, the thing made up of the king's *consilarii*, was *consilium*". So far as evidence is given it appears that a small council or a select number of lords might be summoned by writ (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 12 Edw. III., p. 517). Moreover whenever trials were held, in order to secure the attendance of all participants, in the nature of things it was necessary to appoint a day. It is likely that the instance cited (Am. Hist. Rev., XIX. 741, note) of a council, *i. e., concilium*, three weeks after Michaelmas refers to a conciliar session such as was frequently held either in conjunction with or immediately after the fall session of the Exchequer. In this case as well as other cases that are mentioned in the same foot-note there is nothing either in the words or the context to indicate whether the council at the moment was great or small, nor could anyone say at what point a small council became great. This argument it would be unnecessary to give so fully, were it not a common fallacy to define institutions too closely by their names, and to press names and phrases into a meaning beyond their contemporary sense. As Maitland has said, "There is for us a besetting sin of antedating modern ideas."

James F. Baldwin.

Kentucky Resolutions of 1798

In 1821 Mr. Jefferson wrote to J. Cabell Breckinridge recounting his recollection of the genesis of the Kentucky Resolutions. In this letter, he gives the impression that a consultation had taken place between John Breckinridge, father of the person to whom the letter was written, Wilson Cary Nicholas, one of Jefferson's two most trusted lieutenants, and himself. He thought the determination to protest against the Alien and Sedition Laws proceeded somehow from that conclave. "Those gentlemen", Jefferson wrote, "pressed me strongly to sketch resolutions for that purpose, your father undertaking to introduce them to that [the Kentucky] legislature, with a solemn assurance, which I strictly required, that it should not be known from what quarter they came. I drew and delivered them to him." Later on, in this same letter, Jefferson asserts that his

memory is not distinct as to the part played by the elder Breckinridge in this conference; but considering his age, and the twenty-three years that had elapsed since 1798, his recollection was far better than that of most old men and far better than his own as to some other events of his earlier career. Upon this letter and others contained in the Breckinridge Papers there was slowly built up a theory of the intimate connection of the Kentucky statesman with the genesis of the Resolutions of 1798. This view is set forth in great detail by Colonel Reuben T. Durrett, of Louisville, Kentucky, in *The Southern Bivouac* for March, April, and May, 1886. A year later Jefferson's great-granddaughter, Sarah Nicholas Randolph, who was also descended from W. C. Nicholas, printed an article in *The Nation* (May 5, 1887) examining the evidence brought forward by Colonel Durrett. Her argument centred around a letter from Jefferson to Nicholas, dated "Monticello, October 5, 1798". This letter is as follows, from the text printed in Paul Leicester Ford's edition of the *Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* which is taken from the Jefferson Manuscripts in the Library of Congress:

To Wilson Cary Nicholas

Monticello *Oct 5. 98.*

Dr. Sir,—I entirely approve of the confidence you have reposed in mr Brackenridge, as he possesses mine entirely. I had imagined it better those resolutions should have originated with N. Carolina. But perhaps the late changes in their representation may indicate some doubt whether they could have passed. In that case it is better they should come from Kentucky. I understand you intend soon to go as far as mr Madison's. You know of course I have no secrets for him. I wish him therefore to be consulted as to these resolutions. The post boy waiting at the door obliges me to finish here with assurances of the esteem of Dr Sir your friend and servt.

President Ethelbert D. Warfield of Lafayette College was then putting the finishing touches on his book, entitled *The Kentucky Resolutions of 1798: an Historical Study* (New York, 1887), which was published in the following autumn. He at once sat down and wrote a reply to Miss Randolph's article and this was published in *The Nation* for June 2, 1887. Warfield upheld the Breckinridge side of the debate, which he was then well able to do, as he had the Breckinridge Papers then in his possession. He declared it was almost impossible to credit Breckinridge's failure to see Jefferson in the weeks before the above letter was written, which evidently had thrown a good deal of doubt on the Jefferson-Nicholas-Breckinridge conference, as set forth in Jefferson's letter of 1821.

The probabilities were entirely in favor of a conference having

been held, for Jefferson was in the habit of inviting his henchmen to pass week-ends or holidays inconspicuously at Monticello. He took a good deal of pains sometimes to obliterate all traces of these meetings and the fact that no evidence of such a conference is to be found in any contemporary writings does not prove anything whatever, one way or the other. About nine months after the date of the above letter, for example, Jefferson invited Madison to come to his house for a conference with Nicholas. Mrs. Madison carried the letter containing this invitation from Monticello to Montpelier; but in the last sentence Jefferson cautioned Madison that his wife knew nothing as to the object of the meeting. In a similar way, Jefferson was sometimes very eager to have all epistolary evidences destroyed, or, at any rate, to have them concealed during his lifetime. In other cases he was extremely careful to preserve copies of letters that he seemed to regard in the nature of vouchers for his good faith or political honesty. To accomplish this, he had two polygraphs constructed and also possessed at least one press for taking copies of his letters by the wet process. As to his other practice, the following letter to W. A. Burwell is to the point. In this he enclosed the draft of a paper and reminded his correspondent that he had promised to copy it himself, "and not to let it be seen by any one in the original: nor is the least idea to be permitted to escape as to the quarter from which it comes". Other letters Jefferson did not sign, and in some cases he commanded his correspondent to "burn this letter". In the case of the letter to Nicholas of October 5, which he evidently wished to have preserved, the copy in the Jefferson Manuscripts at Washington bears the endorsement:—"See his letter of Oct. 4. 98. to which this is an answer. Copy of a letter time not permitting a press copy this was immediately written from recollection and is nearly verbal." It appears from this, therefore, that the only copy we have of this particular letter is not the original, not a polygraph duplicate, not even a press copy, but is merely Jefferson's recollection of what he had written. It might easily be argued, therefore, that this letter was no better evidence than that of 1821.

In addition to these difficulties, Jefferson's papers have suffered vicissitudes. They have been moved about, have been divided into two groups, one relating to his public life, and the other to his private relations. This division was made by his descendants and does not always closely follow any line of demarcation. In addition, some of the public papers somehow got separated from the rest and are even now rather apart from the general collection in the Library of

Congress as described in the published calendar. Among these is a letter from Wilson Cary Nicholas to Jefferson, dated October 4, 1798, which is plainly the letter referred to in the endorsement of Jefferson's letter of October 5. Nicholas writes that he has put into

> the hands of Mr. John Breckinridge a copy of the resolutions that you sent me, he says he is confident that the legislature of Kentucky (of which he is a member) will adopt them. . . . he was very anxious to pay his respects to you but we both thought it best that he should not see you, as we believed if he did the resolutions would be attributed to you. I ventured to inform him that they came from you.

There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of this letter. It appears clearly from it that Breckinridge did not go to Monticello on this visit to his old home near Charlottesville; that he had no part whatever in the inception of the protest against the Alien and Sedition Laws and that their passage by a Kentucky assembly was rather a matter of accident than of design. Colonel Durrett seems to have shown without chance for debate that there was considerable revision of the Resolutions after they left Jefferson's pen, and before their introduction into the Kentucky legislature; but as to who made these changes and the reasons for their being made, that is an entirely different matter.

EDWARD CHANNING.

SLAVE CRIME IN VIRGINIA

To promote the suppression of crime, various colonies and states provided by law that the owners of slaves capitally sentenced should be compensated by the public at appraised valuations. This brought it about that, although slaves were generally tried by courts not of record, in many cases documents reciting the convictions were officially filed. In Virginia the reimbursement was made through the state treasury. Accordingly it happens that in the great mass of archives recently made accessible in the Virginia State Library sundry packages contain some thirteen hundred vouchers, each recording the conviction of one or more slaves for a capital crime. So far as my knowledge goes, no comparable record has come to light in another commonwealth.

The earliest voucher is dated 1774; but the six which fall in that decade are so few as to indicate that the file is imperfect.[1] In

[1] [Among notes which the managing editor of this journal made in 1891 from the miscellaneous papers of the legislative session of 1774, then recently dis-

the seventeen-eighties the vouchers list 66 convictions; in the nineties, 112; and in the first five decades of the nineteenth century, 179, 185, 242, 210, and 168, respectively. All vouchers for the years 1856, 1857, and 1858, and apparently some of those for 1859, are missing. In those preserved for the rest of the fifties there are 168 convictions recorded, and 26 in 1860, 28 in 1861, 15 in 1862, 6 in 1863, and 7 in 1864, when the series ends. The total number of convictions from first to last, thus recorded, was 1418; and all but 91 of those convicted were males.

In 301 cases the crime is reported merely as a felony, or else without any specification at all. Of the 1117 offenses definitely stated, 346 were murder, discriminated as follows: murder of master, 56; of overseer, 7; of other white man, 98; of mistress, 11; of other white woman, 13; of master's child, 2; of other white child, 7; of free negro man, 7; of slave man, 59; of slave woman, 14; of slave child, 12 (all of which were murders by slave women of their own children); of persons not described, 60. Of the murderers 307 were men and 39 were women.

For rape there were 73 convictions, and for attempts at rape, 32. This total of 105 cases was quite evenly distributed by years in proportion to capital crime in general; but in the territorial distribution there was a marked preponderance in the newer counties of the Piedmont and the Shenandoah Valley, as compared with the older district of the Tidewater where there were but 21 convictions all told. In two cases at least the victims were white children, one described as an infant, the other as under ten years old. In two more instances they were free mulatto women, though in one of these the conviction was merely of "suspicion of rape". That a voucher should have recorded sentence on suspicion and that the prisoner should actually have been transported under it shows not only an extreme amateurishness of the court but a surprising acquiescence by the governor. None of the vouchers tell of the rape of slave women; but this is far from proving that such were immune. The whole record, which might easily be supplemented with cases from other states, refutes the oft-made assertion that white women were never assaulted by negroes in the ante-bellum South.

Convictions for poisoning and attempts to poison, including the administering of ground glass, numbered 55 (40 men and 15 women), in most of which the crime was directed against white

covered and not yet arranged, he finds succinct mention of twenty-two slaves condemned to be hanged—one in 1770, nine in 1772, eleven in 1773, one in 1774—with an average valuation of £76, but without specification as to crimes. See also *Journals of the House of Burgesses, 1773–1776*, p. 11 (March 5, 1773).]

persons. Associated with this category was the conviction of a man in 1794 and a woman in 1823 for administering medicine to white persons—a capital offense under the law. The sentence in the former case is not recorded. In the latter the court recommended the prisoner to the governor's mercy, and her sentence of death was commuted to transportation. If other arrests were made under this precautionary law the prisoners were doubtless either acquitted or pardoned.

For other assaults, attempts to murder, and the like, there were 111 sentences falling within the purview of the vouchers, only two of which were described as being directed against negro victims. Sentences to corporal punishment do not appear in the vouchers except by chance. One of these, in 1854, was for abetting an attempt at murder. The sentence imposed was thirty-nine lashes on the first day, fifteen on the second, fifteen on the third, fifteen on the fourth, and thirty-nine on the fifth. Doubtless the prisoner would have greatly preferred the sentence of transportation which was given his principal in the crime.

For insurrection and conspiracies to that end 91 slaves were convicted, including 36 in Henrico County in 1800 for participation in Gabriel's uprising, and 17 in 1831, mostly in Southampton County, as followers of Nat Turner. The rest were scattering. Fourteen convictions occurred, indeed, in 1802, but they were distributed in three isolated counties.

For arson there were 90 slaves convicted, including 29 women. For burglary there were 257, with but one woman among them. The highway robbers numbered 15; the horse thieves 20; and those sentenced for other sorts of theft 24, with no women in these categories. Strikingly unusual convictions were those of a slave in 1827 for forgery, and of another in 1839 for causing to be printed certain writings denying the right of masters to property in their slaves.

The only unusual punishment recorded in the vouchers was that of a slave in Rockridge County, 1786, who for the murder of a fellow slave had his head cut off and stuck on a pole at the forks of the road. The least of the offenses of which details are given was that of entering a kitchen and stealing one silver spoon, in Nottoway County, 1789, for which the thief was put to death. The laws and their administration were more severe in the eighteenth century than afterward.

Occasionally the vouchers furnish more or less unexpected sidelights. In 1788 a citizen of Amelia County was paid £80 for a slave who had been killed after proclamation as an outlaw. In

1801 Tom and Pharaoh were bought for $500 each and emancipated by the state in reward for public services, presumably in connection with the repression of Gabriel's insurrection. In 1805 a slave who two years before had been sentenced to transportation in punishment for burglary reappeared and was executed, and his master was then given compensation. The inference is that the master had been allowed to deport the slave privately. Several other vouchers indicate similar irregularities. A few vouchers note that the slaves convicted belonged to free persons of color, and in one case that the slave, along with other property, had been given to a free negro girl by the last will of a white man. One of the negroes convicted, furthermore, was described as a slave for a term of years. Several of the convicts broke jail after sentence, but their masters were paid for them notwithstanding.

The court, the commonwealth's attorney, and private citizens occasionally asked the governor to pardon a slave. Where pardon was granted the case does not appear in the vouchers; but where the sentence was commuted to deportation or imprisonment the vouchers give the facts. A peculiar ground for petitioning is given in the following which is drawn from a source outside the vouchers: "A young negro, a valuable tradesman in this town, is condemned to die on the tenth of next month. His master employed no attorney, and it is the general opinion he has a much greater regard for the high value set upon his negro than for life. From our long friendship I petition you to pardon him."[2]

Many of the vouchers in the eighteenth century omitted mention of the sentences imposed; but nearly all the rest recorded sentences of death. In the nineteenth century, on the other hand, nearly two-thirds of the sentences prior to the gap in the file after the middle of the fifties imposed transportation, either in the first instance or upon commutation by the governor, while the rest were to death, except for a few scattering commutations to imprisonment. From 1859 to 1863 most sentences were commuted to labor upon the public works; but in 1864, although the blockade then made exports from the Confederacy virtually impossible, there was a curious reversion to sentences of deportation.

From the fact that the domestic slave-trade had carried many thousands of slaves from the Virginia Tidewater it might be surmised that, through the sale of the refractory, disorder would there

[2] Letter of William Ramsay, Alexandria, Va., June 20, 1792, to the governor of Virginia. *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, V. 600. Another petition with many signatures supported this, and the sentence was commuted to transportation. *Ibid.*, pp. 617, 624.

have been reduced below the normal. While in regard to rape this is borne out by the record, the ratio of slave crime in general runs squarely counter. As a rule the convictions were nowhere so numerous in proportion to the slave population as in the Tidewater and the closely adjacent portions of the Piedmont. To explain this there comes to mind the ante-bellum belief that the presence of free negroes tended to make the slaves disorderly; and in fact an excess in the ratio of the free negro population to that of the slaves existed in most of the counties where slave crime was excessive.

The rates of compensation to the masters of the condemned slaves of course varied widely. The subjoined chart will show the fluctuations from year to year in the average appraisals of those who may be reckoned to have been prime field hands. From $800 in 1861, these valuations rose to $900 in 1862, $3000 in 1863, and $4000 in 1864 in Confederate money. But that is merely to say that Confederate paper depreciated still more swiftly than did slave property.

Ulrich B. Phillips.

Average Valuations of Prime Field Hands convicted of Capital Crime in Virginia, 1782–1861.

DOCUMENTS

Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780–1782

Part I.

The letters from Lafayette to the Chevalier de la Luzerne, the French minister to the United States, that are here printed were found in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris, by Mr. Leland, during his investigations on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. That they should have remained unknown until the present time, not having been seen even by Doniol, is due to the fact that they are in that part of the sub-series *États-Unis, Supplément,* that has only recently been made accessible. This part is composed of the archives of the French Legation in the United States, which were sent to Paris some time during the first half of the nineteenth century. The volumes constituting them contain, not only the letters from Lafayette, but a great number of letters from various French officers who served in the American Revolution. With one or two exceptions, noted below as they occur, Lafayette's letters are in his own hand, his secretary having returned to Paris (see no. VIII.); consequently the originals, remaining in the archives of the legation, are unique. Of the letters composing the group, only one has previously been printed: that is the letter of September 26, 1780, recounting the discovery of Arnold's treason, which is to be found in the *Mémoires* of Lafayette, and in Charlemagne Tower's *Lafayette in the American Revolution.* It is to be noted that this letter is not in Lafayette's hand, and doubtless a copy of it was retained among his papers. With the exception of this letter, all the letters found are here printed. They constitute an interesting contribution to the history of Lafayette's participation in the establishment of American independence.

The historical setting of Lafayette's second period in America, 1780–1781, is too well known to require elaboration here. It will be remembered that he had returned to France upon leave of absence early in 1779; that he was instrumental in securing military aid; and that in April, 1780, he returned to America to announce the coming of Rochambeau's army and of de Ternay's fleet, and to resume his duties as major-general in the Continental Army. Arriving in Boston on the *Hermione* on April 28, he reached Washington's head-

quarters, at Morristown, on May 10, and very shortly proceeded to Philadelphia, where he conferred with members of Congress and especially with the Chevalier de la Luzerne, who had arrived in America in September, 1779, to succeed Gerard as minister plenipotentiary.

The correspondence with Luzerne, which commenced in May and continued through 1781, deals largely with military affairs. The first few letters relate mainly to the preparations to be made for the arrival of Rochambeau's army; then follow letters discussing the general problem of the campaign of the combined armies, Lafayette being desirous of undertaking an operation against New York; after these are letters relating to military movements, culminating in the Virginia campaign of 1781 and the surrender of Cornwallis.

In printing the texts care has been taken to preserve the orthography of the originals—except that the capitalization and the punctuation, both of which are often exceedingly doubtful, have been modified in order to secure greater clearness. The work of editing the letters has been performed by Mr. Waldo G. Leland and Dr. Edmund C. Burnett, of the staff of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

I.

PHILADELPHIE le 17 May 1780[1]

En arrivant au Camp, Monsieur le chevalier, j'eus l'honneur de vous envoyer les depèches du gouvernement, et la lecture de mes instructions[2] a du achever de vous faire connoitre les intentions du Roy dans le secours puissant que sa Majesté veut preter a ses allies mais d'apres ce que vous m'aves fait l'honneur de me dire sur le peu de details que vous avés receu des Ministeres de la Guerre et de la Marine, je vais me conformer à vos désirs en y ajoutant ce qui est parvenu à ma connoissance.

Mr. de Corny Commissaire des guerres est chargé des instructions de Monsieur le pr. de Montbarrey et de Mr. le c'te de Rochambeau.[3] Je

[1] Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (Paris): Correspondance Politique, États-Unis, Supplément, tome XIV., fols. 85–86 v. All letters here printed are A. L. S. unless otherwise indicated.

[2] Vergennes's instructions to Lafayette of March 5, 1780, are printed in Doniol, *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États-Unis*, IV. 314–320. The substance of the instructions is given in Perkins, *France in the American Revolution*, pp. 296–298.

[3] Louis Éthis de Corny, commissary of troops, was sent to America with Lafayette to make the necessary preparations for the reception of the French troops under Rochambeau. He was instructed to purchase 100 caissons, 1200 to 1500 horses, 2000 head of cattle, 3000 sheep, and various other supplies. The funds he had received in France, 50,000 livres, were quite insufficient and he was obliged to depend upon Luzerne for raising the necessary further amount. The minister, although embarrassed by lack of instructions from his government, was

compte le trouver au camp à mon retour et vous demanderai vos ordres par lui, que lui même viendra recevoir dans peu de jours. Je vous ai en attendant donné une idée generale des besoins qu'aura Mr. de Rochambeau, et c'est d'apres cet apperçeu que vous avés la bonté de prendre les mesures preliminaires.

Mr. de Corny n'a avec lui que Cinquante mille francs, et on devoit lui donner des lettres de change que par un malentendu il n'a pas pu obtenir. Mais comme le Ministre lui fixe les achats à faire, comme ces emplettes doivent preceder l'arrivée des troupes, et que l'argent assigné dans l'etat du fonds que je vous ai communiqué pour le departement d'approvisionements est fort au dessous de ce qu'il en coutera surement, ce n'est que par vos secours pecuniaires que Mr. de Corny peut se trouver en etat de remplir les ordres dont il est chargé.

Avant de quitter Versailles, j'eus l'honneur de representer au gouvernement que n'ayant en Amerique d'autre qualité que celle d'officier Americain, et mon devoir m'obligeant de m'adonner entierement au soin des troupes qui me seroient confiées, et à l'activité d'une vie purement militaire, je ne pouvois me mêler aucunement de la partie des finances, et des arrangements d'argeant vis a vis du Congrés. Je demandai que Mr. de Cornie eut une lettre pour vous que lesdits arrangements devoient regarder, et representai que dans les achats à faire, je ne pouvois que donner des Conseils.

Il fut decidé, et Monsieur le pr. de Montbarrey me l'assura positivement "que je ne devois me considerer en Amerique que comme officier Americain, que ma mission se bornoit à annoncer au G'al Washington le secours envoyé, et à m'occuper avec lui des expeditions; que les autres arrangements vous regardoient, et que les détails d'approvisionements etoient confiés à Mr. de Corny, enfin que je ne devois repondre que de mon zele à donner des conseils comme françois, et des secours comme Americain".

Vous trouverés, Monsieur le chevalier, plus de details dans les instructions de Mr. de Corny, et les lettres qu'il pouvoit avoir pour le recommander à vous. Je puis seulement vous prevenir que tous les arrangements doivent etre signés par vous, et vous assurer que les precautions dont vous vous occupés pour avoir mille bœufs, 1200 moutons et trois cent chevaux du Connecticut, ainsi que des farines, chevaux d'artillerie, et waggons de Pensilvanie, des chevaux de selle de Virginie et Maryland, de la bierre, du cydre, les preparatifs pour quelques bâtiments ecuries, et les lettres de change que vous tirerés sur le tresor de la guerre, se rapportent entierement aux instructions de Mr. de Corny et aux intentions du gouvernement qui dans tous ses projets m'a paru avant toutes choses compter sur vos soins, sur vos secours, et y mettre la plus grande confiance.

Quelques soient les instructions de Mr. de Corny, je connois trop son

able on his own security to procure some 600,000 livres. De Corny was given by Congress a brevet commission of lieutenant-colonel of cavalry. For details respecting de Corny and his instructions, and the efforts of Luzerne to raise funds, see Balch, *French in America*, I. 101, II. 55, 88; Stone, *Our French Allies*, pp. 189, 192, 193; *Journals of the Continental Congress* (ed. Hunt), June 5, 1780; Luzerne to Vergennes, June 3, 1780, in Aff. Étr., Corresp. Pol., États-Unis, XII. 62 (copy in Library of Congress, French Alliance Transcripts, box 7); Luzerne to Lafayette, *ibid.*, Supplément, XIV. 108–110 v. The Prince de Montbarrey was of course the Minister of War.

honneteté pour ne pas vous assurer qu'il sera charmé de concerter avec Mr. Holker[4] ou telle autre personne que vous designeres toutes les mesures qui vous paraissent concourir au bien public.

Permettes moi, Monsieur le chevalier, de rappeler à votre idée deux points interessans: le premier est de savoir si les troupes françoises seront payées et payeront elles mémes en or ou en papier,[5] le second est que par l'incertitude des expeditions il me paroitroit ruineux pour Mrs. les officiers d'acheter des chevaux qu'au bout de quinze jours ils seront peutêtre obligés d'abandonner pour entreprendre une autre operation maritime, et qu'ayant egard à la cherté de toutes choses le Roi devroit ou en partie ou ce qui vaudroit mieux totalement se charger de cette depense.

Quant à moi, Monsieur le chevalier, je ne suis ici qu'un officier americain, et en cette qualité je me croirai heureux qu'aucune partie de mes pouvoirs puisse concourir à vos desirs; donner avec franchise mon opinion, et executer avec zele vos ordres, voilá le departement qui me regarde, et je m'acquitterai de ces deux devoirs avec un plaisir egal au sincere et respectueux attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre

Votre très humble et obeïssant
serviteur

LAFAYETTE

J'ai l'honneur de vous remettre,
1ere Mes instructions, 2d un projet signé de Mr. le c'te de Vergennes, 3° la 1ere instruction de Mr. de Corny et deux autres lettres de Mr. le pr. de Montbarrey, 4° Une grande lettre de Monsieur de Sartine, 5eme les etats de situation du detachement;[6] je ne perdrai pas un moment à vous envoyer Mr. de Cornv.

LF.

II.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 24 May 1780[7]

Cette lettre-ci, Monsieur le chevalier, vous sera remise par Mr. de Corny; il avoit une grande impatience d'aller prendre vos ordres, mais suivant [ce] que nous en etions convenus j'ai cru devoir l'arrêter ici pour des arrangements preliminaires. Son zele, son honneteté, et ses connoissances m'assurent que vous trouveres un agrement particulier dans les affaires que vous aurés à traiter avec lui.

Les lettres qu'il aura pour vous, ses instructions detaïllées, et tout ce qu'il poura vous dire lui même vous mettront au fait de tous les objets de sa Mission et des moyens qu'il a de les remplir.

[4] John Holker, consul-general and naval agent of France.

[5] The question as to whether purchases for the French should be paid for in paper or in specie is discussed by Luzerne in his despatch to Vergennes of June 4, 1780, *ibid.*, XII. 63 (copy in L. C., French Alliance Transcripts, box 7). It was feared that the use of specie by the French would greatly depreciate American paper. Congress voted that "it is the opinion of Congress that the public service will be best promoted by having the same currency made use of, as far as may be, to procure supplies for the forces of his Most Christian Majesty as for those of these United States." *Journals*, June 5, 1780.

[6] For Lafayette's instructions see *supra*, note 2. The "projet" was the secret instructions printed by Doniol with the formal instructions. The instructions of de Corny have been described in note 3; the other documents have not been located.

[7] Fols. 91–92 v. Morristown.

Dans une longue conversation que nous avons eüe avec le General Washington, et le G'al Greene, il a fait differentes questions dont on lui donnera demain les reponses.[8] Si le Quartier Maitre general[9] de notre armée peut l'engager a fournir le quinze de juin sur la Rivière du Nord les caissons et chariots, les chevaux de monture et d'artillerie demandés par Mr. le c'te de Rochambeau, et si les fournitures se font d'une maniere sûre et œconomique, il paroit que votre intention sera remplie, que les achats de ce genre faits par Mr. Holker serviront de suplement à ce que le G'al greene ne pourroit pas procurer, et que les soins de l'agent general de la Marine[10] nous deviendront plus particulierement importants pour l'article des provisions.

En vous renvoyant aux reponses du G'al Greene que je ne connois pas encore parfaitement, je me permettrai de faire une observation; c'est que par ma derniere conversation avec Mr. le c'te de Maurepas, il ne paroissoit pas que le Ministre fut decidé au transport des 150 chevaux d'officiers dont parle Mr. le c'te de Rochambeau.

Ce que vous me dites dans votre note, Monsieur le chevalier, sur les bâtiments-ecuries dont Mr. Holker doit se pourvoir, me semble etre un article d'autant plus important que dans des expeditions maritimes les batiments transportent à la fois les chevaux de selle et d'artillerie des troupes francoises et Americaines.

Quoique persuadé qu'il est necessaire de s'adresser aux gouvernements pour les premiers preparatifs d'approvisionements, le G'al Washington pense que dans la suite il sera plus economique de se procurer les bœufs, moutons, et [*sic*] par des marchés avec des particuliers.

Vous verrés, Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons consulté le G'al Greene sur la maniere de nourrir par entreprise tous les chevaux de l'armée françoise.

Quant a l'hopital de la Providence, le general Washington fait partir le docteur Craig[11] pour chercher un emplacement convenable, et d'aprés une lettre dont il est muni pour le gouverneur, il poura s'occuper des moyens d'avoir la viande fraiche, les volaïlles, le lait, les legumes dont les malades auront besoin. Il est aussi chargé de chercher des maisons propres à servir de magazin pour les differents articles dont l'armée françoise voudra se debarasser.

Le docteur Craig ne prendra cependant aucun parti, à moins que l'escadre francoise n'arrivat subitement; dans tout autre cas, il doit attendre Mr. d'Annemours,[12] et ne lui donner que des renseignements sur les moyens d'executer sa mission. L'objet du G'al Washington en l'envoyant à la Providence, est non seulement d'aider Mr. d'Annemours, mais plus particulierement encore de prevenir la circonstance inattendüe ou l'escadre entreroit dans le port avant l'arrivée du consul. Si Mr.

8 *Cf.* Washington to Schuyler, May 21, in Ford, *Writings,* VIII. 282.

9 *I. e.,* General Nathanael Greene, who at this time was quartermaster general.

10 *I. e.,* Holker.

11 Dr. James Craik, at this time assistant director general of hospitals, later chief physician and surgeon of the army. He was at Fort Necessity in 1755 with Washington, and after the Revolution was the latter's family physician. For details respecting his mission to Providence see Stone, pp. 189–198; Washington to Heath, June 2, in Ford, *Writings,* VIII. 307; *cf.* also Bronson, *History of Brown University,* p. 71 *et seq.*

12 D'Annemours or d'Anmours, one of the French consuls in the United States.

d'Annemours passe par le quartier general, nous lui donnerons des lettres de recommandation.

C'est d'aprés vos conversations avec Mrs. Holker et de Corny que vous pouvés decider si le premier doit se rendre à l'armée. Lorsque Mr. de Corny aura rempli a Philadelphie les objets qui l'y conduisent, et ceux dont vous voudrés le charger, il paroit desirer de visiter lui même les etablissements de la Providence en passant par le quartier general, et le Connecticut. Il est à souhaitter qu'il ait fait le voyage assés promptement, pour retourner au point ou on decidera le debarquement des troupes françoises et pour rendre compte à leur General des differents objets dont il est chargé.

Voilà, Monsieur le chevalier, toutes les reponses à la note que vous m'aviés remise. Si vous avés de nouveaux ordres à me donner, je serai bien heureux de les executer.

L'amitié particuliere qui m'attache à Monsieur de Corny, me fait penser avec plaisir que vous partagerés mon opinion sur son compte. Il ne sera pas moins empressé que moi à se mettre sous votre direction; Agreés, je vous prie, l'hommage du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre, Monsieur le Chevalier, Votre

tres humble et obeissant
serviteur

LAFAYETTE

III.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 24 May 1780[13]

Les objets dont j'ai a vous parler, Monsieur le chevalier, etant de nature differente, j'ai cru devoir les diviser en trois lettres, et consacrer celle-ci à la politique.

Le Commité n'est pas content de ses pouvoirs;[14] ils disent qu'ils ne peuvent que recommander, et à moins de prendre sur eux tous les risques ils ne sont pas en etat de mettre en activité les ressources du païs. Le Congrés doit recevoir de leur Committé les plus fortes representations à cet egard; mais pour ne pas perdre de tems, ils ont ecrit une lettre aux differents etats dont nous avons besoin, et cette lettre doit, disent-ils, produire de bons effets.

Nous serons, j'espere, en etat d'agir vers le quinze de juin. Notre armée commencera alors à etre augmentée, et dans les premiers jours de juillet nous aurons tout ce que nous pouvons rassembler et reunir pendant la Campagne.

Si cependant l'escadre arrivoit sur le champ, le General est determiné à forçer de moyens, et dût-il oublier les formes ordinaires, nous ne consulterons que la necessité de nous mettre en marche, et de cooperer promptement avec les troupes françoises.

J'ai été d'autant plus à portée de connoitre cette disposition que nous avons eu ces jours-ci la nouvelle qu'une flotte françoise etoit devant New-York. Je n'ai pris aucune confiance dans cette histoire, mais par

[13] Fols. 93–94 v.

[14] This was the "committee to proceed to headquarters" elected by Congress on April 13, 1780. It consisted of Philip Schuyler, John Mathews, and Nathaniel Peabody. The instructions of the committee were voted on April 12; see *Journals* at dates mentioned. The letter from the committee to the states, referred to here, was dated May 25, and is to be found in L. C., Cont. Cong. Papers, Washington Papers, and elsewhere.

un exces de precaution j'ai envoyé Mr. de Gimat[15] sur la Côte avec une lettre pour le Commandant de cette escadre pretendue.

Mr. le chev. de Fayolles,[16] et Mr. de Rochefontaine[17] sont partis pour les points de Judith et de Sekonnet avec des instructions et des signaux. J'ai parlé de l'etablissement d'une chaine d'exprés, et si vous en avés une du Cap Henry à Philadelphie, je tacherai d'en former la continuation de Philadelphie à Rhode island.[18]

Par toutes les nouvelles de l'est, il paroit qu'il y a eu dans les isles une bataille navale. Les papie[r]s Anglois se donnent l'avantage, les Americains decident en notre faveur. La seule raison que j'ai de compter sur notre victoire est que les deux flottes etoient, dit-on, egales.[19]

Dés qu'il y aura au quartier general la moindre nouvelle interessante j'aurai sur le champ l'honneur de vous en faire part; j'ose vous demander la même grace, Monsieur le chevalier, et tacherai de la meriter par mon exactitude à vous instruire de nos progrés et de nos efforts pour nous mettre en etat d'agir.

Si le Congres n'a pas rappellé les Brigades du Maryland, il paroit que nous devons renoncer à cet avantage.[20]

J'ai envoyé à Rhode island des renseignements sur les points ou il seroit plus sûr et plus commode de placer les vaisseaux et les troupes françoises.

Je compte sur vos bontés, Monsieur le chevalier, pour faire partir autant de copies de mes lettres à Mr. de Vergennes que vous en envoyés de votre part. Dès que j'aurai quelqu'un propre à remplir ce soin, je tacherai d'eviter à Messieurs vos secretaires une telle peine.

Agreez, je vous prie, l'hommage des tendres sentiments avec lesquels j'ai l'honneur d'etre

Votre tres humble et obeïssant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

Permettés, je vous priè, que Monsieur de Marbois[21] trouve icy un million de tendres compliments, et les assurances de mon Attachement.

[15] De Gimat, colonel and aide-de-camp to Lafayette; he came to America in 1777 as a volunteer. See Balch, II. 135.

[16] De Fayolles, lieutenant-colonel, came to America in 1777. See Doniol, III. 223; the Boston *Gazette* of June 12, 1780, refers to his death as of June 8.

[17] Bichet de Rochefontaine, brevet captain of engineers, later major. See Balch, II. 217.

[18] On June 5, Congress voted "That the governors of . . . Virginia and Maryland be requested immediately to engage trusty persons in those states respectively, at proper distances from each other, on the main road from Cape Henry, in Virginia, to Philadelphia, to hold themselves in readiness, should the French fleet be discovered off that cape or the adjacent coast, to forward intelligence thereof . . . in the most expeditious manner." *Journals*, June 5, 1780.

[19] The French fleet under de Guichen and the British fleet under Rodney had three engagements in West Indian waters on April 17, May 15, and May 19, See Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power*, p. 378; Chevalier, *Histoire de la Marine Française pendant la Guerre de l'Indépendance Américaine*, p. 185 *et seq.*; Boston *Gazette*, May 29; *cf. infra*, letters of May 27 and June 30.

[20] In April de Kalb had been sent with troops of the Maryland and Delaware lines to reinforce Lincoln. He had only reached Petersburg when he learned of the fall of Charleston. Winsor, VI. 475.

[21] Barbé Marbois was at this time secretary of the French legation in Philadelphia; later he was appointed consul-general. Wharton, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, I. 426.

D'apres la demande de Mr. de la Touche[22] vis a vis du Conseil de Boston qui a eu le meilleur effet comme j'avois eu l'honneur de vous le dire, on me mande que le conseil l'a prié de faire une croisière de huit jours, et je vois avec plaisir qu'il rentrera dans le tems ou votre lettre peut arriver à Boston.

IV.

Au Quartier General le 24 May 1780[23]

D'apres la lettre que vous me fites l'honneur de me communiquer, Monsieur le chevalier, au sujet du duel entre Mr. le ch'r de Fayolles et Mr. de Valnais,[24] vous vous rappellés que je me contentai d'applaudir à la conduite de Mr. de la Touche, et qu'avant de former un jugement j'attendis des eclaircissements sur cette affaire.

Il m'en est parvenu depuis qui fixent mon opinion, et en empêchant Mr. de Fayolles de se rendre comme il comptoit auprés de vous, parce que je croiois sa presence necessaire à Rhode island, il m'a prié d'avoir l'honneur de vous ecrire pour vous faire connoitre ce que j'ai appris, et ce que lui même avoit l'intention de vous dire.

A un diner de ceremonie donné par Mr. de la Touche aux Membres du Conseil de Boston, Mr. de Valnais est venu avec l'uniforme de colonel commandant du Regiment d'Artois dragons, premiere faute très reprehensible. Pendant le diner, il a manqué de respect à Messieurs du Conseil et à Monsieur de la Touche en troublant la fête par des regards et propos offensans contre un des convives, Mr. le chev. de Fayolles, seconde incartade non moins déplacée; et lorsque pour eviter une scene Mr. de Fayolles a été se promener sur le pont Mr. de Valnais a manqué d'une maniere essentielle au pavillon du Roy par l'insulte la plus grave à cet officier, troisieme faute que la qualité de Consul rend encore plus impardonable.

Lorsque le lendemain il se battit au pistolet avec Mr. de Fayolles et fut blessé dans le combat, le Conseil de Boston ne se mêlat aucunement de l'affaire, et des personnes de consideration assurerent Mr. de Fayolles qu'il pouvoit rester à Boston avec toute tranquillité.

Des amis de Mr. de Valnais ayant repandu que Mr. de la Touche avoit envoyé ses officiers pour servir de temoin, le Capitaine de la frégatte eut de Mr. de Valnais lui même un desavœu de cette fausseté.

Il paroit qu'on approuve generalement la conduite de Mr. de Fayolles, et cet officier etant par sa naissance, par sa qualité de Capitaine commandant au Rgt. de Brie, par l'interest vif que des personnes respectables prennent à lui, etant dis-je plus particulierement obligé à rendre compte

[22] Louis R. M. La Vassor de la Touche-Tréville, captain commanding the French frigate *Hermione*, the vessel in which Lafayette had just returned to America. See Doniol, IV. 280, 285; Tower, II. 93, 95; Heath, *Memoirs of the American War*, p. 248.

[23] Fols. 95–96 v.

[24] De Valnais was French consul at Boston. Blanchard refers to the duel in his *Journal*, pp. 51–52; the account given here by Lafayette is one of the fullest to be had of this affair. Luzerne approved Lafayette's attitude in his letter to the latter of May 28: "Je suis fort aise . . . du parti que vous avez pris d'envoyer Mr. de Fayolles à une destination particuliere. J'ai ecrit à cet officier. J'espère qu'il m'aidera par sa conduite ultérieure à prévenir les suites de son affaire, et qu'il me mettra à même de seconder l'interêt que vous et M. le C'te. de Broglie prenés a Lui." Aff. Étr., États-Unis, Supplément, XIV. 108.

de sa conduite, etoit parti de Boston dans l'intention de se rendre aupres de vous.

Il comptoit vous dire, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'il venoit vous porter plainte contre Mr. de Valnais qui par une insulte aussi grossiere l'avoit forcé d'oublier son caractere public; que son affaire n'avoit aucune suite exceptés celle qu'il pouvoit lui même y donner; qu'il prenoit la liberté de vous demander la punition du Consul; mais si le Consul concevoit son caractere public, il vous prioit dans tous les cas de ne pas oublier quelle insulte il avoit receue.

Comme mes instructions portoient d'envoyer dans tous les points des officiers françois, et que Mr. le chev. de Fayolles m'a paru propre a cette commission j'ai cru devoir l'engager à negliger pour l'instant ses affaires personnelles. Mais en lui donnant une marque de confiance qu'il n'auroit surement pas obtenue si j'avois eu le moindre doute sur sa bonne conduite dans cette affaire, j'ai cru ne pouvoir sans injustice refuser de vous soumettre ce qu'il vouloit avoir l'honneur de vous dire lui même.

Recevés je vous prie, Monsieur le chevalier, l'assurance du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre Votre tres humble et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

V.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL le 25 May 1780[25]

Lettre secrete

J'ai l'honneur de vous prevenir, Monsieur le chevalier, que pour tromper les ennemis sur l'objet de notre expedition, le General Washington desire que je fasse un projet de proclamation aux habitans du Canada.[26] Cet ecrit sera imprimé avec le plus grand secret, mais on aura attention de le faire passer à New-York. Quant aux autres exemplaires, exceptés celui de New York ils seront jettés au feu à l'arrivée des troupes françoises; ainsi je puis dire tout ce qu'il me plaira dans un ouvrage destiné à ne jamais paroitre.

Si vous approuvés cette idée, et si vous voulés me faire passer une Marque avec les armes du Roy, elle pourra servir à tromper encore d'avantage les espions de l'ennemi.

LAFAYETTE

Si vous me repondés sur cet article, il faudroit que ce fut par une occasion particuliere et bien sûre.

[25] Fol. 97.

[26] A copy of the proclamation is in the volume containing the present letters, fols. 98–101. In it Lafayette announced the sending of French troops to America and called upon the Canadians to unite with the combined French-American forces. The tenor of the declaration is quite opposed to that of the instructions to the spies sent to Canada by Lafayette (see *infra*, note 73). The purpose of the former was of course to deceive the English into believing that Canada instead of New York was the objective of the operations to be undertaken upon the arrival of Rochambeau. Probably, however, the British were not greatly misled. *Cf.* Tower, II. 113–115; Washington to Lafayette, May 19, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 44; same to Arnold, June 4, *ibid.*, 72; same to Greene, May 31, *ibid.*, 65; Doniol, IV. 370.

VI.

Au Quartier General le 25 May 1780[27]

Ce n'est pas sans peine, Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons obtenu du General Greene qu'il prendroit des engagements. Il a dans le moment beaucoup d'affaires, mais en consentant à se charger des notres, il m'a fait les deux observations suivantes.

1ere qu'il est necessaire de lui fournir l'argeant en nature.

2eme que ne pouvant pas prevoir les arrangements qu'il feroit, au point d'en fixer le prix, ce soin devoit etre abandonné à sa discretion pour faire les meilleurs marchés possibles.

D'aprés ce que vous me marqués dans votre note, j'ai cru remplir vos intentions en priant Mr. de Corny d'écrire une seconde lettre au General Greene, ou il lui propose de se charger de la totalité des chariots et chevaux dont nous avons besoin, en ne fixant que le tems et la quantité ainsi que le lieu du rendés vous. Bien entendu que cette lettre est une simple supposition subordonnée à ce qu'il vous plaira de decider.

Le General Greene prendra dans sa reponse les engagements qu'il croit pouvoir remplir, et attendra pour commencer ses operations la reponse definitive qui ne peut etre envoyée que de Philadelphie.

Aussitôt qu'il aura receu cette derniere lettre de Monsieur de Corny autorisé par vous, il se mettra en devoir d'executer ses engagements aux conditions ci-dessus mentionnées. Il observe que les preparatifs ne peuvent commencer qu'à l'instant ou il recevra ce dernier mot de Philadelphie.

Le General Greene n'etant animé que par le desir d'obliger, vous prie, Monsieur le chevalier, d'examiner si vous avés des moyens plus prompts, plus sürs, ou plus œconomiques pour remplir les intentions du Roy, car dans ce cas, et même à avantage egal, il desire etre dispensé de ces soins dont il ne se charge que par bonne volonté et par zele pour la Cause Commune.

Agrées, je vous prie, l'assurance du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre

Votre tres humble et
obeissant Serviteur
Lafayette

VII.

Morris town ce 27 May 1780[28]

Si je ne suis pas en etat, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous donner sur le combat des isles une nouvelle certaine, je vais au moins vous donner une probabilité de plus en notre faveur.

Le Colonel Sherburne arrivant des etats de l'est assure qu'il est arrivé un bâtiment aprés un passage très court, et ce bâtiment rapporte d'une maniere très circonstanciée " que les deux flottes egales en nombre se sont battues depuis le matin jusqu'au soir avec acharnement; que celle des ennemis a été ecrasée au point de ne pouvoir plus tenir la mer et qu'ils se sont enfuïs dans leurs ports; que le vaisseau de Rodney est le plus maltraité ", et l'on a meme dit au C'l Sherburne le nombre de tués et blessés à bord de cet Amiral. Le C'l Sherburne ne doute aucunement de cette nouvelle, et pour etre sincere, j'avoüerai que je n'en suis pas moins persuadé.

[27] Fols. 102–102 v.

[28] Fols. 104–104 v.

Le paquet d'avril est arrivé à Newyork; il a quitté l'angletere vers le quinze, mais les nouvelles de france sont de la fin de mars. Il ne parle pas de ce que nous attendons; on avoit donné ordre aux bâtiments Anglois à convoyer pour l'amerique de se joindre à leur escorte vers le milieu d'avril. Il parle aussi de l'amiral Graves qui n'etait pas parti.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Agrées je vous prie l'hommage des tendres sentiments que je vous ai voués.

LAFAYETTE

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Monsieur de Marbois.

VIII.

MORRIS TOWN le 3 juin 1780[29]

Je n'ai receu qu'avant hier, Monsieur le chevalier, la lettre dont vous m'avés honoré le vingt six du mois dernier, et la marche lente du chariot qui la portoit m'a fait penser que je devois attendre pour vous ecrire les reponses à mes lettres portées par Monsieur de Corny. Elles vous rendoient compte de mes demarches depuis mon retour au Quartier General, et comme nous etions convenus que dés l'instant de mon arrivée à Boston il n'y en avoit pas eu un seul de perdu, vous verrés que jusqu'à aujourdhuy nous n'avons pas à regretter l'employ de notre tems. J'attendois avec la plus vive impatience vos reponses à mes lettres, mais je prevoiois que le retard étoit employé à nous assurer de meilleurs arrangements.

Vos lettres du 28, 29, et 31 May me sont parvenues hier si tard que je n'ai pu les communiquer au General Washington. Mon premier soin ce matin a été d'en conferer avec lui, et de peser avec la plus grande attention tous les articles sur lesquels vous demandés reponse.[30] Le reste de la matinée a été employé à me rendre ches le General Greene et causer avec lui sur les deux articles pour lesquels vous desires son assistance. Je lui ai ensuite ecrit une lettre detaillée, et j'attendrai pour fermer ma lettre la reponse qu'il a promis de m'envoyer.

Sans vous, Monsieur le chevalier, sans votre credit, et les peines que vous avés prises, il etoit impossible de bien remplir les intentions du Roy. Avec votre secours, je ne doute pas que Mr. de Corny n'y reussisse. Les 600,000 livres sont un grand article, et l'arrangement que vous faites en faveur de notre papier rend aux etats unis un service bien essentiel.[31] La resolution relative aux deserteurs fera, je crois, un grand plaisir aux generaux françois.[32]

En partant pour la Providence le docteur Craig avoit receu des ordres etendus pour tous les arrangements preliminaires. J'espere en consequence que l'absence de Mr. d'Annemours pourra etre remplacée par le docteur, et le General Washington avoit prié le gouverneur Greene[33] de

[29] Fols. 116–118 v.

[30] *Cf.* Washington to Luzerne, June 5, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 73.

[31] *Cf. supra*, notes 3 and 5.

[32] "Resolved, That it be recommended to the legislatures of these United States to pass laws for the punishment of such persons as shall encourage desertions from the fleets or armies of any foreign power who shall prosecute the war in America in conjunction with these United States, and for recovering such deserters as shall endeavour to conceal themselves among the inhabitants." *Journals*, May 27, 1780.

[33] Washington to Governor Greene, May 25, in Stone, *French Allies*, p. 189 *et seq.*

donner toutes les facilités possibles; je crois cependant que si vous trouvés Mr. d'Annemours il sera bien fait de l'envoyer sur le champ. Il est à souhaitter que Mr. de Corny s'y rende bientôt et y porte l'argeant dont vous me parlés. Comme le Major General Heath devoit se rendre de Boston à l'armée, le General lui a mandé de s'arrêter à la Providence, d'y preparer ce qui dependra de lui pour la reception de l'armée et de la flotte françoise, enfin d'interposer son autorité et ses bons offices pour tout ce qui pourra leur etre avantageux et agreable.[34]

Apres avoir discuté dans le plus grand detail les besoins des troupes françoises et les probabilités de nos operations, le General Washington ne croit pas devoir diminuer le nombre de chariots et chevaux d'artillerie dont vous faites mention et qui a été fixé par Mr. le c'te de Rochambeau.[35]

Quant aux chevaux de la legion de Lauzun,[36] le General ne pense pas qu'on en ait pour le moment un besoin urgent. Cinquante ou soixante chevaux pour porter des messages, pour escorter les officiers generaux lui paroissent suffire dans la disette d'argeant ou nous nous trouvons. Si nous devenions plus riches, il desireroit aller jusqu'au nombre requis pour former une Compagnie suivant l'ordonnance françoise. Si vous n'achetés que cinquante chevaux pour Mr. de Lauzun, voila 300,000 livres d'epargnées.

Si Newyork devient impossible, une expedition en Canada paroit offrir de grands avantages et l'on pouvoit bien y penser en cas que le congres, divisé à ce sujet finit par en approuver le plan.[37] Je ne parle cependant ici que comme particulier, et les nouvelles de l'ennemi peuvent seules determiner les projets du General.

On m'a promis que dans trois jours nous pourrons ecrire par la nouvelle chaine d'exprés.

Tout ce que nous entendons dire ici semble confirmer l'avantage de Mr. le c'te de Guichen, mais rien d'officiel encore, et même rien qui porte un caractere bien authentique.

Si l'on en croit la publication par autorité, les ennemis auroient pris Charlestown le 12 du mois dernier;[38] mais j'avoüe que j'ai toujours été au nombre des incredules. Au moment ou j'apprendrai quelque chose de l'armée de Clinton, je m'empresserai de vous en instruire, et d'ecrire au cap Henry par votre chaine depuis Philadelphie si elle est etablie.

Comme nous avons des farines et autres provisions appartenantes au

[34] Washington to Heath, June 2, in Sparks, *Writings,* VII. 71; *cf.* Heath to Washington, July 12, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington,* III. 12. See also Heath's letters to Washington in *Heath Papers* (Mass. Hist. Soc., *Collections,* seventh series, vol. V.), p. 64 *et seq.*, also Lafayette to Heath, June 11, *ibid.*, p. 66.

[35] Luzerne had suggested the possibility of reducing the number of horses and wagons asked for by Rochambeau, and had left the matter to be decided by Washington and Lafayette. Luzerne to Lafayette, May 31, in Aff. Étr., États-Unis, Supplément, XIV. 110.

[36] Armand Louis de Gontaut-Biron, duc de Lauzun. Lauzun's legion was a separate organization in the army of Rochambeau. Wharton, I. 411; Balch, II. 160.

[37] The idea of an attack on Canada appealed to Lafayette; he had strongly urged it in the fall of 1778, but the project was disapproved of by Washington and Congress. See *Journals,* 1778, *passim,* and January 1, 1779; *cf.* Tower, II. 11–23, 47–48.

[38] *Cf.* Washington to General Robert Howe, June 1, 1780, Sparks, *Writings,* VII. 69.

Continent à transporter sur la Rivière du Nord, et comme la formation de ce Magazin est un preliminaire necessaire à notre cooperation avec les troupes françaises, nous vous demandons, Monsieur le chevalier, que les chariots engagés par Mr. Mitchele,[39] et ceux du G'al Greene soient chargés des differentes articles qui se trouveront sur leur chemin en se rendant à la place du rendés vous. Si vous approuvés cet arrangement qui ne retarde point l'execution des vostres le General donnera ses ordres en consequence. Si même par un hasard imprévu les troupes françaises etoient obligées de retarder leur depart de Brest, le Continent pouvoit alors vous proposer de prendre le louage des chariots a son compte jusqu'à l'arrivée de l'escadre

Dans ma lettre au G'al Greene, je lui demande d'avoir les chariots avant le vingt de juin ou sur la Rivière du Nord ou sur celle du Connecticut. Je copie mot à mot les conditions demandées dans les lettres que j'ai receües, et je le prie en même tems de trouver un homme qui se charge de nourrir les chevaux de l'armée, et les boeufs et moutons qui la suivront.

J'ai lu, Monsieur le chevalier, vos reponses au Memoire de Mr. Corny, et elles me paroissent remplir dans toute leur perfection les vues du gouvernement que mon sejour à Versailles m'a mis à portée de connoitre.

Ce n'est pas vous, Monsieur le chevalier, qui avés besoin d'excuse pour ne pas m'écrire de votre main les longues lettres; c'est à moi de vous demander pardon pour vous forcer à lire mon griffonage, mais j'ai eu l'honneur de vous raconter comment mon Secretaire etoit retourné à Paris.

J'espere recevoir incessamment de vos nouvelles, nous n'en avons pas encore receu des differents etats; j'ai ecrit de mon coté et j'ai tacher [*sic*] d'ajouter dans la balance le peu de poids que peut avoir mon influence particuliere. Je m'empresserai à vous mander tout ce qui me paroitra devoir vous interesser.

Voulés vous bien, Monsieur le chevalier, presenter à Monsieur de Marbois l'assurance de mon tendre attachement. Agrées, je vous prie, l'hommage de tous les sentiments, et de la sincere amitie avec laquelle je serai toute ma vie

Monsieur,

Votre tres humble et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

le 4 Juin à Cinq heures du Matin

Je reçois enfin la reponse du General Greene, et l'attends depuis longtems ce matin pour fermer ma lettre; Mr de Corny pourra rapporter celle que je joins ici, et causera lui-même au Quartier General avec le G'al Greene. l'expres me permet d'etre demain à dix ou onze heures à Philadelphie.

VIII.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL PRÈS SPRING FIELD
12 Juin 1780[40]

Permettés-moi, Monsieur le chevalier, d'avoir l'honneur de vous donner quelques eclaircissements sur une lettre de Mr. de Corny dont il a bien voulu m'envoyer la copie. C'est à propos des waggons que nous

[39] John Mitchell, deputy quartermaster general in Philadelphia.

[40] Fol. 119. Springfield in New Jersey.

desirions charger de provisions Continentales, et je ne voudrais pas que l'expression *insister* dont se sert Mr. de Corny put donner trop de force à la demande que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous faire. Il est vrai que le General Washington a *repeté que cet arrangement lui sembloit plus avantageux aux interests communs de la cooperation,* mais sans insister aucunement, il laisse entierement cette affaire à votre desiçion, et vous prie de faire ce qui vous paraitra à vous-même le plus convenable.

Notre armée et celle des ennemis sont dans la même situation, et entre autres contrarietés que nous cause cette sortie de Knypausen,[41] je compte pour beaucoup le retard qu'epprouvent mes reponses à vos dernieres lettres et à celle de Monsieur de Marbois.

LAFAYETTE

IX

SUR LES HAUTEURS PRÈS SPRING FIELD le 15 Juin 1780[42]

J'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer, Monsieur le chevalier, les dépêches de Monsieur de la Touche, et vous y verrés le malheureux evenement qui nous prive de Mr. le ch'r de Fayolles.[43] Les soins de Mr. de la Touche ont sauvé les instructions et les papiers; comme il n'y avoit pas de tems à perdre, j'ai sur le champ mandé à l'autre officier françois (Mr. de Rochefontaine) qu'il devoit se charger d'executer seul la mission que j'avois divisé entre lui et Mr. de Fayolles. L'impossibilité d'aller promptement à bord en partant des points Judith et Sekonnet, et celle de confier avec quelque sureté des papiers sur Blok island, obligent les officiers françois à rester sur l'isle de Rhode island pour porter mes lettres à l'escadre. Il suffira donc de Mr. de Rochefontaine sur ce point pour avoir les depêches et mots de reconnoissance, et j'ai prié Mr. de la Touche de faire avec le gouverneur Greene les meilleurs dispositions pour qu'à l'apparence de la flotte les signaux convenus fussent elevés sur les points mentionnés dans mes instructions.

Vous verrés, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'en se rendant à Philadelphie Mr. de la Touche a fait deux prises Angloises, et a soutenu un combat trés vif avec *l'Iris* fregatte ennemie qui etoit envoyée de Newyork à Hallifax.[44] Comme je connoissois vos intentions, et que votre reponse seroit arrivée trop tard j'ai cru devoir prevenir d'avance Mr. de la Touche que sa presence à Philadelphie etoit interessante pour des provisions: mais je ne sais s'il pourra etre assés tôt reparé pour s'y rendre. Si vous avés d'autres ordres à lui faire parvenir, je tacherai de les envoyer avec toute la diligence possible.

J'ai l'honneur de joindre ici les lettres de Mr. de la Touche pour Monsieur de Sartine qu'il vous prie de vouloir bien faire passer par deux occasions differentes, et je vous supplie de mettre avec celle qui est decachetée la lettre de moi à ce Ministre ou je lui parle du combat de l'Hermione. J'en ai joint un duplicata à la lettre cachetée, qui n'est qu'une copie de l'autre.

[41] This was the attempt of General Knyphausen to invade New Jersey from New York with nineteen regiments of British troops. *Cf.* Bancroft, *History,* V. 423; Washington to President of Congress, June 10, Sparks, *Writings,* VII. 75.

[42] Fols. 120–120 v.

[43] *Cf. supra,* note 16.

[44] See Heath, *Memoirs,* pp. 249, 251–253, 256; Blanchard, *Journal,* p. 39; Boston *Gazette,* June 12, 1780.

Nous sommes toujours dans la même position, les ennemis restent tranquilles derriere Elizabeth town, et l'on se borne à quelques coups de fusils de postes avancés qui ne determinent rien: il paroit que le General Knypausen a envie de nous attaquer, mais il est retenu ou par la crainte de se compromettre ou par l'attente de Sir Henry Clinton. Soit qu'il veuille operer ici, ou faciliter un mouvement vers la Riviere du nord, ou simplement nous arrêter dans le jersay, il reussit à detourner une partie de notre attention des preparatifs necessaires à la cooperation. Je voudrois au moins que nous fussions joints par des recrües de pensilvanie et de jersay.

Agrées, je vous prie, Monsieur le chevalier, l'hommage du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être,

Votre tres humble et obeissant serviteur

LAFAYETTE

XI.

SUR LES HAUTEURS PRES SPRING FIELD le 20 juin 1780[45]

Jai receu ce Matin, Monsieur le chevalier, la lettre dont vous m'avés honoré le seize de ce mois, et ne puis que m'affliger avec vous des fautes par lesquelles nous perdons un corps considerable de troupes.[46] Les efforts de lord Cornwallis pour faire revolter les Ecossais n'auront, je crois, que trop d'effet.[47] Il faut tâcher de reparer ici, mais nous avons besoin des troupes françaises, et nous n'en recevons encore aucune nouvelle.

Je suis charmé d'apprendre que les particuliers de Philadelphie montrent un patriotisme aussi utile;[48] il est facheux que le public representé par leur dictateur[49] ne se soit pas rendu aux propositions du Commité et du Commandant et chef, etait refusé de completer les bataillons à 500 hommes: il paroit que l'etat de jersay portera à ce nombre les trois Regiments qu'il a dans l'armée, et qu'à ces quinze cent soldats sous la banniere Continentale, ils ajouteront six cent miliciens employés par le General jusqu'au mois de janvier prochain. Le gouverneur Clinton me mande que nous serons contents de l'état de Newyork.[50]

Je viens de lire au general la partie de votre lettre qui a rapport à la flotte francaise, à vos achats, vos esperances, et la farine que vous nous prêtés. Ce secours est essentiel, et nous le recevons avec reconnaissance.

[45] Fols. 124–125 v.

[46] Referring to the loss of Charleston?

[47] *Cf.* McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution*, pp. 549–560; Van Tyne, *American Revolution*, p. 298. Scottish merchants, citizens of Charleston, had presented a congratulatory address to Clinton.

[48] This refers to the offer of Philadelphia bankers and merchants to aid in securing supplies for the army. See *Journals*, June 22, 1780. A partial list of the "particuliers" is in Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution*, p. 236.

[49] Doubtless this refers to Joseph Reed, president of the council of Pennsylvania, upon whom practically dictatorial powers had recently been conferred by the resolution of the assembly of June 1, 1780. See W. B. Reed, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Reed*, II. 208; *cf.* Lafayette to Reed, May 31, *ibid.*; also Washington to Reed, May 28 and July 4, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 293, 329; Reed to Washington, June 5, July 12, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, II. 463; III. 15.

[50] *Cf.* Clinton to Washington, June 13, *ibid.*, II. 472.

Vos arrangements me paroissent avancer, et si comme patriote je vous en ai bien de l'obligation, elle augmente en raison de l'interest particulier que je prends à la Cooperation. Il est bien utile, je crois, de preparer des navires pour le transport des chevaux. En un mot, Monsieur le chevalier, ce que vous avés fait ne pouvoit l'etre que par vous, et cependant c'etoit le seul moyen de remplir les differents objets du gouvernement. Je suis tellement interessé dans cette affaire, que je me sens quelquefois prêt à vous remercier pour mon propre compte comme le doit faire la france et l'amerique.

Notre position n'a pas changé, et il ne s'est rien passé d'important sur ce coté-ci de l'eau. Les ennemis ont construit un pont de batteaux pour leur communication avec Staten island, ils en fortifient la tête du coté du jersay, et par leur situation compacte semblent craindre de se compromettre. Le dix sept au soir l'amiral Arbuthnot a passé Sandy hook, et le dix huit il a fait une visite au G'al Knypausen. Nous apprenons ce matin que le G'al Clinton est arrivé, mais nous ne pouvons pas encore avoir de nouvelles bien certaines sur les vaisseaux et les troupes qu'ils ont ramené de Caroline. A moins d'accidents extraordinaires, nous recevrons cette nuit des intelligences sûres et detaillées;[51] j'ai un exprés qui partira sur le champ pour Rhodeisland, et je vous enverrai des duplicatas pour le Cap henry. Les nouvelles qu'aura le General fixeront son opinion sur les premieres dispositions que pourront faire Mrs. les generaux françois.

J'ai l'honneur de joindre ici, Monsieur le chevalier, des lettres de Mr. de la Touche pour france, que je prends la liberté de vous recommander, et particulièrement celles pour son pere et Mde. de Monthieu. Quant à moi, à moins d'une occasion bien sûre dont vous auriés la bonté de m'avertir, j'attendrai l'arrivée de l'escadre, et comme ils feront sûrement partir un bâtiment pour en porter la nouvelle, ne pensés vous pas, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'ils devroïent etre avertis d'attendre les depêches dont vous pourriés les charger? Je vous demanderois alors la permission d'y joindre les miennes.

Si vous lisés la gazette de Newyork, Monsieur le Chevalier, vous y verrés une lettre du G'al Maxwell[52] ou il se plaint de n'avoir pas de bottes. Nous sommes d'autant moins honteux de notre nudité qu'elle prouve la vostre et le patriotisme de l'armée Americaine; mais comme elle ne fait pas autant l'eloge du public que nous servons vous devriés bien conseiller à vos amis dans le Congrés d'imaginer un moyen pour vêtir les officiers de leur Armée.

Agrées, Monsieur le chevalier, l'hommage du tendre attachement que je vous ai voué.

LAFAYETTE

Oserai-je vous prier de faire un million de compliments à Monsieur de Marbois, et de vous informer si le fils du C'l Nevile, appellé le lt. C'l Preslay Neville[53] mon ancien aide de Camp se trouve etre au nombre des prisonniers?

[51] *Cf.* information from secret agent in New York, dated June 24 (Friedenwald, *Calendar of Washington Manuscripts in the Library of Congress*, p. 153), according to which Clinton reached Sandy Hook on the 23d with 5000 men.

[52] Brigadier-General William Maxwell of New Jersey. He resigned from the army on July 25, 1780.

[53] Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel Presley Neville, taken prisoner at Charleston May 12, 1780, exchanged in May, 1781. Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army*.

XII.

Sur les hauteurs de Spring field ce 21 juin 1780[54]

J'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer, Monsieur le chevalier, deux lettres que je vous prie de cacheter et de faire ensuite parvenir au Cap henry;[55] Vous y verrés le peu d'informations que j'ai pu me procurer, et le parti que le General Washington propose aux Generaux françois. J'envoye des lettres à peu prés pareilles à Rhode island, mais avec cette difference que si la flotte atteri à cette isle, on lui conseille d'y attendre les nouvelles que je m'empresserai de donner. Dans tous les cas, Monsieur le chevalier, nous esperons en savoir assés dans deux jours pour fixer definitivement les premiers mouvements de l'escadre et des troupes françoises. Je vous ferai passer sur le champ mes premieres lettres pour le Cap henry.

Ne sachant pas encore ou se porteront les efforts de l'ennemi, nous ne perdons pas de vüe la Riviere du Nord. Deux Brigades se sont portées hier au soir de ce coté; deux autres Brigades ont pris cette nuit la même route. Celles de Maxwell et de Stark restent ici pour le present avec la Milice. Nous nous occupons de la transportation des baggages et magazins. Je suivrai demain le General Washington pour joindre le gros de l'armée, et sans nous trop ecarter du jersay, nous prendrons une position moins hors de portée pour le secours de Westpoint.

En vous priant de faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois, j'ai l'honneur de vous assurer, Monsieur le Chevalier, de la tendre Amitié que je vous ai voué pour la vie.

Lafayette

Le General me charge de vous faire un million de Compliments.

Lf.

XIII.

Au Camp de Ramapauh le 30 juin 1780.[56]

Le genre de vie que nous avons mené depuis trois semaines, Monsieur le chevalier, nos occupations, notre proximité de l'ennemi et le danger de garder avec nous des papiers importants, voilà les raisons qui ont mis de l'inexactitude dans ma correspondance avec vous. Je vous rendis compte dans ma derniere lettre des mouvements que nous allions faire vers la Riviere du Nord. Les Brigades de Connecticut sont à West Point, et après l'action ou commandoit le G'al Greene[57] et dont vous aurés appris en même tems que moi les details, notre petite armée s'est réunie aux environs de Pompton ou elle attendra une partie de ses recrues. Les ennemis paroissent avoir renoncé à de grands projets, et occupent un petit coin de terrain depuis la Riviere du Nord jusqu'à la sonde. L'avantage d'assembler des Milices contre eux ne vaudroit pas celui que nous perdrions en retardant les operations de l'etat de Connecticut.

Je ne sais, Monsieur le chevalier, s'il est une de mes lettres qui ne vous soit pas parvenüe, mais j'avoue que n'ayant pas pu garder les votres

[54] Fols. 126–126 v.

[55] Doubtless these letters were similar to the letter of May 19 to Rochambeau printed in Lafayette, *Mémoires*, I. 335. *Cf.* Washington to Lafayette, May 16, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 274.

[56] Fols. 133–133 v. Ramapaugh in New Jersey.

[57] This was the battle of Springfield, June 23, 1780. *Cf.* Greene to Washington, Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 506.

avec moi, j'ai cru devoir differer quelques jours à vous repondre sur le Canada;[58] j'ai lu ce que vous me mandiés au G'al Washington: l'idée d'asservir ce pais, et celle de le conquerir avec l'intention de le rendre sont egalement revoltantes; d'un autre coté l'affranchissement des Canadiens devient fort interessant à la tranquillité des etats unis. Mais le General Washington n'arrête pas ses vues sur ce projet; il n'en parle que comme d'une chose possible, et ce n'est pas même le plan dont il est dans ce moment occupé. La delivrance des etats unis me paroit etre le premier objet, et je conviens que si nous avons les moyens suffisants pour y reussir, cet avantage sera le plus agreable de tous pour la france et pour l'amerique.

J'ai receu, Monsieur le chevalier, une lettre de Mr. Holker ou il me fait quelques questions auxquelles je crois que Mr. de Corny vous a repondu par une lettre de Morristown. Quant à ses autres demandes, les projets de detail de Mr. de Corny ne me sont pas parfaitement connus et je crois que vous feriés bien de decider sur ces articles; car il faudroit du tems avant de recevoir une reponce de la Providence.[59]

Mr. de Corny vous aura mandé, Monsieur, que le general desiroit que les waggons se portassent du coté de la Riviere de Connecticut. Vos emplettes me paroissent aller fort vîte, et vous pourrés regarder ces achats sans argent comme une operation magique dans le tems present. Vous vous rappellés, Monsieur le chevalier, que vous me chargeates d'arrêter les mesures que nous avions fait entreprendre au General Greene, et que ce changement n'a pu se faire assés tôt pour qu'il n'y eut pas déjà quelque chose de commencé. Il m'a montré une lettre de Mr. Mitchell çoncernant quelques waggons couverts auxquels se bornera son Memoire, et j'ai l'honneur de vous en envoyer la copie parcequ'il me paroit juste de payer ce qu'il a depensé pour nous, et que vos arrangements avec Mr. Mitchell rendront ce payement plus facile.

Le bruit de l'apparition d'une flotte française soit sur la côte de Louisbourg soit sur d'autres parties eloignées s'est naturellement repandu en Amerique, et remplira le but que vous vous proposiés lequel me paroit avantageux pour retenir les ennemis chés eux, et les tenir en suspens sur nos projets.

Les lettres de Boston, Monsieur le chevalier, confirment la nouvelle de la flotte et de l'armée espagnole;[60] je vous fais un million de remerciements d'avoir bien voulu m'en instruire.

Le nombre de troupes et de vaisseaux que nous avons dans les isles semble nous assurer les plus grands avantages. Si l'on en croit Mr. Revington lui même, il y a eu un engagement entre Mr. de Guichen et l'amiral Rodney ou six vaisseaux anglois doublés en cuivre par un enchainement incroiable d'accidents plus facheux les uns que les autres *have been Mauled at an unmerciful Rate.* Mais après avoir perdu 180 hommes, ils s'en sont tiré fort honorablement, et l'armée angloise étoit en sureté à quatre lieues *sous le vent* de la notre. En verité, Monsieur le chevalier, il est permis de livrer son coeur an plus flatteuses esperances, et je compte bien fermement sur une brillante campagne.

Mais il nous manque ici des hommes, et les etats n'en donnent pas

[58] *Cf. supra,* note 37.

[59] *I. e.,* from de Corny, who was now at Providence. Stone, *French Allies,* p. 192.

[60] Referring doubtless to the Spanish military force under Galvez which was operating against Florida.

autant que je voudrois. Nous n'avons même pas receu toutes les reponses et comme la connoissance de nos forces doit décider les premieres mesures à prendre dans le plan de la campagne, le General Washington veut savoir sur quoi compter avant que j'ecrive les lettres promises à Mrs. les generaux français.[61] J'espere cependant pouvoir leur donner de nos nouvelles aujourdhuy ou demain, et en envoyant ma lettre à Black point[62] elle leur pourra parvenir à tems en cas que mes dernieres depêches du Cap henry les aient determiné a s'y rendre.

Le G'al Stark est envoyé à l'etat de Newhampshire, et nous ne savons pas encore un mot de ce qu'ils feront.[63] Les personnes d'influence dans l'etat de Machashushet m'ont repondu des lettres fort detaillées mais se bornent à promettre trois mille neuf cent hommes que le G'al Glover a été recevoir.[64] L'etat de Rhode island fera, je crois, a peu prés, ce qu'on leur demande, mais c'est une bien petite addition.[65] Connecticut avoit d'abord voté quinze cent hommes, nombre fort au dessous de leur quota; mais le G'al Parsons[66] qui y a été envoyé me mande qu'ils iront peut être à deux mille cinq cent qui ne sont pas encore suffisans. New York avoit malentendu la demande, mais j'espere que leurs quatre regiments seront plus complets que les autres. L'etat de jersay paroit assés bien disposé, mais leurs recrues ne sont pas arrives. La pensilvanie fait moins que tous les autres,[67] et le Maryland offre de donner un Regiment au lieu de la Milice, ce qui n'est peut être pas desavantageux si ce Regiment est composé des premiers hommes qu'ils auront et s'il arrive tout de suite.[68]

En recevant hier votre lettre, Monsieur le chevalier, j'ai examiné le dernier etat de situation de l'armée, et je suis faché d'avouer qu'on ne vous a pas parlé avec franchise. Mais j'aime mieux que ce soit la faute des particuliers que celle des etats, et je vais vous dire exactement notre situation relativement aux deux principaux objets. Mashashushet a seize Regiments dont le total ne montent à présent, tout compté, qu'à 1804 hommes. Les Regiments devant etre de 504, vous voyés que leur

61 *Cf.* Washington to Committee of Co-operation, June 19, in Ford, *Writings,* VIII. 316. See also Luzerne to Congress, June 18, in Wharton, III. 803, and resolution of Congress of June 21, in *Journals.*

62 *Cf. supra,* note 55. Black Point is on the Connecticut shore, west of New London.

63 See General Stark's instructions in Washington to Stark, June 30, Sparks's *Writings,* VII. 97; *cf.* Washington to Weare, June 30, *ibid.,* p. 96. See also Stark to Washington, July 13, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington,* III. 13.

64 Brigadier-general John Glover of Massachusetts.

65 *Cf.* Heath to Washington, June 21, *Heath Papers,* p. 74; "The General Assembly of this State [R. I.] have passed a resolve to raise the number of men required to compleat their battalions".

66 Brigadier-general Samuel H. Parsons of Connecticut; see his letter of June 24 in Hall, *Life and Letters of Parsons.*

67 *Cf.* Reed to Washington, July 15, Sparks, *Letters to Washington,* III. 15; same to President of Congress, July 17, *Penn. Archives,* first series, VIII.; report of committee of Congress, *Journals,* July 26.

68 *Cf.* Jenifer and Beall to Washington, June 22, Sparks, *Letters to Washington,* III. 3. On the general subject of the quotas, especially the efforts of Luzerne to have the army brought up to its full strength, *cf.* Luzerne to the President of Congress, June 18, Wharton, III. 803, and the resolves of Congress of June 21, *Journals. Cf.* Washington to Committee of Co-operation, August 17, in Ford, *Writings,* VIII. 383.

quota est de 8064, que par consequent ils doivent 6260 pour lesquels on donne non plus 5000 mais environ 3900 hommes.

La pensilvanie a 10 Regiments dont le total se monte à present à 2153; leur quota est 5040, donc ils doivent 2887 dont mille ou douze cent hommes *ne forment pas la Majeure partie.* Dans cet état-ci, je ne fais aucune mention d'un onzieme Regiment qui est au fort pitt.

En vous envoyant ce detail si particulier, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous prie de considerer que j'en fais part plus à mon ami qu'au Ministre du Roy, qu'il ne doit pas affecter vos idées comme homme public, et je ne doute pas que vous n'en usiés avec reserve vis a vis les personnes qu'il interesse, en leur disant cependant qu'ils sont infiniment loin de leur quota, et que mille n'est pas la Majeure partie de trois mille.

Le president Reed, Monsieur le chevalier, craint de perdre sa popularité par des mesures vigoureuses, et useroit de ses pouvoirs avec energie si l'on pouvait lui faire voir que sa mollesse irritera contre lui le peuple, et qu'elle l'empêchera d'etre choisi à la premiere election. Il a d'ailleurs beaucoup de vanité, et l'esperance d'etre connu en france; l'assurance que non seulement les efforts de l'amerique, mais ceux de chaque etat auront un droit particulier à la reconnoissance des français pourroient peutêtre le determiner; la seule lettre precise que nous avons receu de lui nous annonce cinquante hommes. C'est à vous, Monsieur le chevalier, à le mettre en mouvement, et si vous pouvés lui faire remplir son quota à 504 hommes par Regiment, si l'etat de Mashashuset veut se mettre en frais, alors nos projets seront bien plus interessants que ceux du Canada, et nous ne penserons qu'a cet objet sur lequel les vœux de tout le monde doivent se reünir.

A propos du Canada, Monsieur le chevalier, comme nous ne nous en occupons pas à present, je vais y envoyer des personnes destinées à nous rapporter des nouvelles,[69] qui si elles sont prises serviront à donner le change aux ennemis. Je vous renvoie vos papiers aux armes de france, ma proclamation a été imprimée sur du papier commun.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier. Agreés, je vous prie, l'assurance du parfait et tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre,

Votre trés humble et obeïssant serviteur.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Monsieur de Marbois.

Mr. Wadsworth[70] m'ecrit qu'il a fait un arrangement avec Mr. de Corny a Hartford pour la nourriture des chevaux de l'armée lorsqu'elle sera arrivée en Amerique.

P.s. Ce que vous m'avés mandé, Monsieur le chevalier, sur le *dollar dur* que l'on doit donner aux soldats me fait un bien grand plaisir. Ne laissés pas oublier ce bon projet; je voudrois que vous employés aussi votre influence à faire donner à chaque officier de l'armée ou un habillement en nature, ou ce qui vaudroit mieux encore une somme *d'argent dur* suffisante pour se vêtir deçemment. Mais il n'y auroit pas de tems à perdre, et ce seroit un grand coup.

LF.

quand je parle du quota des etats, Monsieur le chevalier, je compte non pas d'aprés l'ancienne requisition du Congrés, mais d'aprés la demande nouvelle du Committé et du general ou l'on n'a point d'egard aux

[69] *Cf. infra,* note 73.

[70] Doubtless Jeremiah Wadsworth, former commissary general of purchases.

hommes dispersés pour je ne sais quel service public dans tous les coins du Continent. C'est des Bataillons à 504 qu'il nous faut. Le general a laissé au Congrés la decision du rappel de l'infanterie *de Lee*,[71] mais il desire qu'elle se rejoigne ici à la Cavallerie, et je vous prie en mon particulier de nous la ravoir.

LF.

XIV.

AU CAMP DE PRECANESS ce 4 juillet 1780.[72]

Vous devés etre etonné, Monsieur le chevalier, de n'avoir pas encore reçeu ma lettre pour Mrs. les generaux français, et je le suis moi même beaucoup des incertitudes qui occasionnent ce retard. Mais aprés avoir reçeu des meilleurs pilotes les connoissances les plus precises sur le port de Newyork, lesquelles sont encore confirmées par les lettres de M. le c'te d'Estaing, je trouve un certain capitaine *Davis* homme fort estimé dans ce païs dont l'opinion ne paroit pas se rapporter à celle des autres. Le General Washington n'en est pas moins surpris que moi, et nous avons envoyé chercher les plus fameux pilotes du port pour les faire causer ensemble devant nous, et fixer enfin nos idees d'une maniere invariable. Nous serons encore plus en etat de donner des intelligences precises sur les vaisseaux et la garnison de Newyork, et comme j'enverrai sur le champ une copie de ma lettre à portée de Black point, elle y arrivera surement avant que mes dernieres depêches au Cap henry aient pu porter Mr. de Ternay devant Newyork.

Mes deux espions de Canada sont partis cette nuit, et j'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer copie de leur instructions. Comme ils prendront un petit parti avec eux, ils tâcheront en cas de malheur de reclamer le caractere d'officiers. Vous verrés, Monsieur le chevalier, que je prends toutes les precautions possibles pour engager les Canadiens a rester tranquilles jusqu'au moment ou nous voudroins les porter à se decider en notre faveur. J'ai fait à mes deux envoyés les plus fortes representations à cet egard, et leur ai même defendu de ramener personne. Je vous prie de vouloir bien me mander votre opinion et me renvoyer les instructions ci-jointes.[73]

Permettés moi, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous presenter une idée, dont je n'ai pas parlé au G'al Washington, et dont vous jugerés mieux que moi la possibilité. Le C'l Laurens est prisonnier et le General qui voudroit l'avoir se fera un scrupule de delicatesse de l'echanger avant son tour. Comme les français ont beaucoup d'avance en officiers sur les

[71] Washington wrote to the Board of War, on June 21, desiring that the infantry of Lee's corps be ordered to join the army; Fitzpatrick, *Calendar of Correspondence of George Washington with the Continental Congress*. On June 29 Congress ordered that the Board of War comply with the request; *Journals*.

[72] Fols. 134–135. Preakness, N. J.

[73] The two agents were Captain Clement Gosselin and Lieutenant Anable Boileau, both of the 2d Canadian (Hazen's) Regiment. A copy of their instructions, dated at Preakness, July 1, is with the present letters, fols. 175–177. In general their mission was to secure information respecting the forces of the enemy in Canada and of the Canadian militia, the attitude of the Canadians, the resources of the country, fortifications, artillery, etc. Gosselin was to deal with Quebec and surrounding country, Boileau with Montreal.

ennemis, seroit-il hors de propos que vous tâchiés de tirer le malheureux Laurens de sa Captivité?[74]

Nos recrues ne viennent pas, Monsieur le chevalier; on dit cependant que l'on se met en marche, mais j'ai grande envie de les voir en personne pour savoir sur quoi nous devons compter.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, voulés vous bien faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois, et compter sur le tendre et sincere attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être Votre tres humble et obeïssant serviteur

LAFAYETTE.

XV.

PREAKANESS ce 10 juillet 1780[75]

Vous devés etre bien etonné, Monsieur le chevalier, de n'avoir pas encore receu ma lettre annoncée pour le Cap henry. Mais le General esperoit que les nouvelles des etats le mettroient à portée de former un jugement plus sur; nous avons eu d'ailleurs une inquisition à etablir sur laquelle nous ne comptions pas. Le rapport de tous les marins, les assurances des meilleurs pilotes, l'opinion de toute l'amerique avoient fixé nos idées sur le port de Newyork, mais à force d'examiner et de comparer nous sommes parvenus à découvrir que les notions de tout le public et de chaque particulier n'etoient pas exactement justes. Ce n'est pas sans peine Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons presque deviné et ensuite determiné d'une maniere sûre les connoissances dont je fais part à Mr. de Ternay et qui le mettront à portée de decider s'il se croit en etat de posseder le port.

Vous verrés par la lettre ci-jointe[76] que dans le cas ou Mr. de Ternay peut entrer en dedans *du hook* et n'y craint pas des forces superieures, le General Washington est entierement decidé pour Newyork. Quant a moi, Monsieur le chevalier, je pense que le port etant à nous il y a tout lieu d'esperer que nous reüssirons. Cette place est sans comparaison la plus importante et si notre escadre est trop faible pour occuper son poste, il est egalement impossible de songer à Hallifax, Charlestown ou Savahana.

Après avoir examiné ma lettre, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous prie de vouloir bien l'envoyer en toute diligence; il est de la plus haute importance que votre chaine d'exprés ne perde pas une minute; si le tems d'avoir un exprés vous laisse celui d'en prendre copie, je vous prierai de l'envoyer chiffrée à Monsieur le c'te de Vergennes en même tems que vos autres depêches. Pardon, Monsieur le chevalier, de toute les peines que je vous donne.

Par un bâtiment marchand arrivé dans l'est on apprend que notre flotte a mis à la voile au commencement de May. D'après le calcul des calmes et des vents mols de cette saison il est à croire qu'elle atterira au Cap henry, et, en y mettant de la diligence, qu'elle y recevra cette derniere lettre; dans tous les cas, celle que je vous ai envoyée avant celle-ci les aura portés sur *Black point* ou je fais passer un duplicata de nos propositions. Comme il est possible qu'avec une force inferieure Mr. le

[74] *Cf. Journals,* July 10, 1780: "Resolved . . . that the Board of War do take the most speedy measures for the exchange of Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens . . .". Laurens had been made a prisoner at Charleston. On December 23, 1780, he was appointed minister to France.

[75] Fols. 147–148 v.

[76] *Cf. supra,* notes 55 and 62.

chev. de Ternay s'etablisse dans le port, comme il est probable qu'il aura plus de vaisseaux qu'on n'annonce, (et peutêtre Mr. du Chaffaut[77] viendra-t-il lui même sous pretexte de convoyer), comme enfin l'amiral Graves peut n'etre qu'un epouvantail, le G'al Washington desire, Monsieur le chevalier, que tout ce qui n' a pas été envoyé sur la Riviere du Nord reste quelque tems à Philadelphie, ou aux environs, mais hors de portée de notre communication. Dès que là flotte paraitra, l'on vous enverra un courier, et vous pourrés faire passer par terre ou faire convoyer par l'Hermione à Sandy hook les articles destinés à l'armée.

Il est impossible, Monsieur le chevalier, de faire à l'avance des preparatifs dans le Jersay qui indiqueroient nos intentions. Mais nous tâcherons de fournir ce qui dependra de nous et cela joint aux végetaux, aux bestiaux etca., etca., que sous un autre pretexte vous pourriés rassembler en pensilvanie, suffira, je crois, completement aux besoins de l'armée française jusqu'au moment de notre jonction. En ecrivant à Mr. de Corny, je lui ai conseillé de revenir ici lorsqu'il auroit fini ses arrangements.

Je joins ici, Monsieur le chevalier. plusieurs lettres que je vous prie de vouloir bien faire remettre. Celles du g'al Schuyller sont trés pressées et contiennent des demandes relatives a la cooperation.[78]

Permettés moi, Monsieur le chevalier, de presènter ici mes compliments à Monsieur de Marbois, et de vous assurer du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre, Votre trés humble et obeïssant serviteur

LAFAYETTE.

Dans les Batiments français en amerique auriés vous du Canon pour des Batteries flottantes? je le desirerois mais en doute fort.

XVI.

Ce 14 à 10 h'e ½[79]

Je viens de recevoir une lettre, Monsieur le chevalier, qui m'apprend l'arrivé de la flotte à Rhode island. Elle etait du moins en vue le 10 à quatre heures du soir et l'on me promet qu'au moment de son entrée dans le port on me depêchera un second courier. Dés que cet exprés et les depêches des generaux français me seront parvenües je vous en donnerai avis avec toute diligence. J'aurai aussi l'honneur de vous mander ce que le G'al Washington desire au sujet des chariots chevaux etca.

On dit, mais non pas d'une maniere certaine, que la flotte consiste en douze vaisseaux de ligne.[80] Je n'ai que le tems de vous assurer de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

[77] Louis-Charles, comte du Chaffault de Besné, appointed lieutenant-general of the French navy in 1777.

[78] Note the letters of the Committee at Headquarters, of July 10, mentioned in Fitzpatrick, *Calendar*, pp. 437–438.

[79] Fol. 149.

[80] *Cf.* Heath to Washington, July 11, Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 12: "The fleet consists of seven sail of the line;—the Duc de Burgogne, of eighty guns; Le Neptune and Le Conquérant of seventy-four; Le Jason, L'Eville, L'Ardent and Le Provence, of sixty-four; Le Fantasque, hospital ship, of sixty-four mounts forty guns; two frigates and two bombs, with about five thousand land forces and one thousand marines."

XVII.

CAMP, july the 16th [*sic*] 1780.[81]

J'ai tant de confiance en vos bontés, Monsieur le chevalier, que je prends la liberté de vous addresser une partie de mes baggages qui me deviennent inutiles pour la campagne. Oserai-je vous prier de vouloir bien ordonner qu'on les depose chés vous (si cependant cet arrangement ne vous embarasse pas) et en vous demandant un million de pardons pour la liberté que je prends, je ne me servirai pas d'un moyen si long pour vous mander des nouvelles, et je me contenterai de vous presenter l'hommage de mon tendre attachement

LAFAYETTE.

XVIII.

AU CAMP ce 19 juillet à 4 heures du matin.[82]

Ce n'est qu'hier au soir, Monsieur le chevalier, que nous avons receu le second exprés attendu de Rhode island, et je me presse de vous envoyer Mr. de Gimat pour vous porter vos lettres et vous donner toutes les informations que vous pouvés désirer. Mr. de Rochambeau ecrit au general qu'il lui ammene une avant garde laquelle sera bientôt suivie du reste des troupes, et l'assure de la part du Roy que Sa Majesté soutiendra cette operation-ci de tout son pouvoir.[83] Mr. du Chaffaut etoit en Rade à Brest et d'aprés le depart de Greaves, je ne doute pas qu'il n'escorte le second envoy; Mais je suis faché qu'on parle hautement de ce projet parceque les ennemis feront des efforts pour intercepter ce qu'ils pourront. Nous avons à Rhode island cinq mille hommes et sept vaisseaux sans compter le vaisseau hôpital qui en fera un huitieme.

En rendant compte au General de la situation, Mr. de Rochambeau croit que ses troupes seront en etat d'agir dans un mois à commencer du moment de leur arrivée. Je pars aujourdhuy pour Rhode island, et en même tems je tâcherai de me rendre utile aux troupes françaises je suis chargé par le general d'arranger definitivement le plan de campagne. Nous aurons vraisemblablement le renfort de france avant que nos alliés soient en etat de quitter Rhode island.

Aussitot que j'ai appris l'arrivée de Greaves avec six ou sept vaisseaux[84] je me suis pressé d'en donner avis, et comme notre projet etoit calculé sur la supposition que les français avoient toutes leurs forces, et sur celle d'une superiorité maritime, je ne doute pas que l'Escadre et les troupes ayant rencontré Greaves en mer n'attendent à Rhode island les reponses à leurs lettres que je leur porterai en toute diligence.

Les français et les Americains à Rhode island sont infiniment contents les uns des autres et tout ceci paroit prendre la meilleur tournure. L'intention du Gouvernement est de soutenir ceci avec vigueur.[85]

[81] Fol. 154.

[82] Fols. 156–157 v.

[83] Rochambeau to Washington, July 12, in Doniol, V. 348. The "reste des troupes" constituted the second division so eagerly awaited by Lafayette, which was destined never to leave Brest; *cf.* Perkins, p. 312.

[84] After having been delayed by storms, Graves sailed from England on May 15, with seven vessels, in pursuit of the French expedition. He arrived off Sandy Hook on July 13.

[85] *Cf.* Heath to Washington, July 12: "for myself, I am charmed with the officers"; and July 16: "The [French] officers express the highest satisfaction at the treatment they meet with". Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 12, 28; *cf.* also Perkins, pp. 306–309.

Le general Washington pense, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'on ne sauroit envoyer trop promptement les waggons, chevaux etca. de l'armée française. Mr. de Gimat va vous offrir ses services, et en qualité d'officier Americain pourra vous devenir utile dans les directions que vous lui donnerés pour veiller à l'arrivée de ces differents articles sur la Riviere du Nord, et les expedier de là pour Rhode island. Je lui ai recommendé d'y mettre toute la diligence possible, et pense que nous rendrons un grand service aux français en leur procurant bien vite tout ce dont ils ont besoin.

Mr. de Rochambeau mande que d'aprés sa position à Rhode island pour soutenir la flotte il ne craint rien pour elle, et se trouve dans une situation respectable.[86]

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, tout ira bien, et puisqu'on nous soutient j'espere que nous seront en etat de porter le grand coup. Agrées, je vous prie, l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois, dites lui que Mr. de Charlus est ici.

Aussitot que je scus l'arrivée de Greaves je vous le fis dire par le docteur Cochran [?][87] et j'attendois pour ecrire le compte que devoient rendre nos postes du jersay que nous n'avons pas receu, je ne sais par quel accident.

L.

XIX.

AU CAMP PRES DOB'S FERRY 8 aoust 1780.[88]

Me voici revenu, Monsieur le Chevalier, et la marche du General sur New York ne m'a pas permis de rester à Rhode Island, mais avant de partir j'ai laissé l'armée française etablie de maniere à ne rien craindre; d'aprés les dispositions de Mrs. de Rochambeau et de Ternay jointes au zele de la milice lequel a beaucoup surpassé ce qu'ils auroient fait pour secourir leurs propres troupes, nous avions, Monsieur le chevalier, de bonnes raisons pour desirer une visite de M. Clinton. Pendant ce tems la notre armée auroit attaqué Newyork, et je serois, j'espere, arrivé assés tôt pour en avoir ma part.

L'armée française est un des [plus] beaux Corps de troupes qu'on

[86] See Rochambeau to Washington, July 12, in Doniol, V. 348–349.

[87] Dr. John Cochran of Pennsylvania, at this time physician and surgeon general of the Middle Department. Heitman, p. 162.

[88] Fols. 158–159 v., L. S.; the postscript is autograph. Since writing the preceding letter Lafayette had visited Newport to confer with Rochambeau and de Ternay; see his instructions from Washington of July 15 in Tower, II. 127. He arrived at Newport on July 24, and found the French fleet blockaded by an English force under Arbuthnot, while Clinton was threatening a land attack from New York. The promptness of the French in establishing themselves on Rhode Island, the action of Heath in coming to the rescue, calling out Rhode Island and Massachusetts militia, and the rapid march of Washington toward New York averted the threatened attack. Lafayette's conference with Rochambeau and de Ternay was for the purpose of settling upon a plan of campaign. The negotiations are summed up by Lafayette in his letter to the French commanders of August 9, printed in *Mémoires*, I. 345. For a general account of Lafayette's mission to Newport see Tower, II. 126–143; *cf.* Lafayette, *Mémoires*, I. 345, note 1; also Heath to Washington, July 25, 26, 31, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III.

puisse voir; leur discipline est admirable et les torys eux mêmes n'ont pû rien trouver à dire à ce sujet. M. de Rochambeau, tous les officiers, et même les Soldats de son armée sont dans les meilleures dispositions, et je ne doute pas qu'il ne regne la plus grande harmonie entre ces deux nations.

L'amour propre national ne peut qu'etre choqué de voir Arbutnot bloquer insolement le Port. Les Sentimens du peuple que j'ai sondés sur mon chemin, et leur impatience de nous voir superieurs me font encore plus vivement desirer un renfort de vaisseaux. Clinton n'attaquera pas Rhode Island, mais la seconde division court des risques, et d'ailleurs vous savez comme moi qu'il est bien necessaire d'operer cette campagne.

Mr. de Ternay a deja ecrit pour cinq vaisseaux des Isles et est autorisé par M. de Sartine à les demander; mais je ne sais si M. de Guichen a son chiffre, et lui ai proposé de faire passer les lettres par votre moyen. S'il m'est permis de donner icy mon opinion Monsieur le Chevalier, je crois qu'une lettre pressante de vous auroit un excellent effet, j'ai pris encore sur moi d'ecrire à cet amiral, et vous supplie de vouloir bien envoyer mon epitre avec la votre et celle de M. de Ternay.[89] Vous ecrirés, je pense par triplicata, et vous avés dû savoir la destination des flottes combinées; j'imagine donc que nos lettres trouveront M. de Guichen à la J——[90] et il est bien essentiel que le secours nous arrive avant le 15 de septembre.

J'aurai l'honneur de vous communiquer Monsieur le Chevalier, un precis de mes conversations avec les Generaux français,[91] mais je ne veux pas retarder un instant l'envoy de la lettre à Mr. de Guichen; vous verrés que sans la superiorité maritime on ne croit pas pouvoir agir, et que si nous ne l'avons pas dans les premiers jours de Septembre les efforts de l'amerique se trouveront n'avoir rien produit, et nous retomberons à l'ancien point ou nous etions.

M. de Rochambeau m'avoit chargé d'une lettre pour vous, et d'une lettre pour le President du Congrés;[92] je devois les communiquer au G'al Washington, mais elles ont eté données par etourderie a M. Matheus[93] qui vous les a fait passer sur le champ; les Français sont trés empressés de recevoir tous les articles achetés pour eux. Leur intendant a fait de nouveaux marchés, et tous ses arrangements sont pris d'apres les notions europeennes. Ils ont de la viande mais manquent de vegetables.

Agreés je vous prie, Monsieur le Chevalier, l'assurance du tendre et sincere attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être

Votre très humble
et obeissant Serviteur

LAFAYETTE.

[89] De Ternay to Washington, August 10: "The Marquis de Lafayette would send, by this opportunity, the letter which I had transmitted to him for the Count de Guichen, and which ought to be translated into ciphers by the Chevalier de la Luzerne. I require, conformably to the orders of the King, a reinforcement of some ships from this French Commander". Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 58; *cf.* Washington to de Guichen, September 12, Sparks, *Writings of Washington*, VII. 195.

[90] Jamaïque.

[91] See *infra*, note 95.

[92] Rochambeau to Luzerne, August 4; same to President of Congress, August 3, both in Doniol, V. 352–354. *Cf.* report of committee on letter of Rochambeau, in *Journals*, August 17, 1780.

[93] Doubtless John Mathews of South Carolina, a member of Congress and of the Committee at Headquarters.

Oserai-je vous prier de faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois. J'ai enfin trouvé moyen de vous epargner quelquefois le dechifrement de mon griffonage; mais j'aime à vous dire moi même combien je vous suis tendrement attaché.

LF.

XX.

AU CAMP PRÈS TAPPAN ce 11 aoust 1780.[94]

J'ai l'honneur, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous envoyer copie de ma lettre a Mms. de Rochambeau et de Ternay, elle vous mettra sous les yeux mes propositions, les reponses de ces Generaux, et les arrangements dont nous sommes convenus; d'aprés les ordres precis du G'al Washington, j'ai du leur dire notre situation actuelle, et l'etat de faiblesse ou nous serons au mois de janvier. Mais en pesant sur les raisons qui exigent une immediate cooperation, j'ai taché de detruire les fausses idées de ces messieurs sur quelques points, et s'ils envoyent copie de ma lettre avec les duplicatas de la leur, on y pourra retrouver les mêmes expressions mais en ordre renversé, car j'avoüe que je ne suis pas de leur avis sur bien des articles.[95]

Ces messieurs croient que l'amerique leur sera trés obligée de servir de garnison à Rhode island, et vous savés que nous ne faisons cas de cette isle que dans son rapport avec les secours qui peuvent arriver de france. Ils croient qu'il est egal d'operer cette campagne ou l'année prochaine, et que l'amerique ne demandera pas mieux que de faire de nouveaux efforts au pringtems, ils pensent qu'il est indifferent que la plus grande proportion de troupes soit française ou Americaine, et s'ils pouvaient avoir quinze ou vingt mille hommes ici ils croient pouvoir sans inconvenient les joindre aux six ou sept mille Americains qui resteroient. Ils ne sont pas assés convaincus que les secours de l'amerique, et particulierement ceux de notre armée leur sont necessaires pour agir dans ce païs-ci. Ils prennent enfin pour le sentiment de l'amerique ce que cinq ou six habitants de Newyork [Newport?] peuvent leur dire en dinant avec eux. Ces idées, Monsieur le chevalier, etoient toutes renfermées dans la lettre dont Mr. de Gimat m'a parlé. Je la connoissois déja, mais on ne peut rien faire sur ce qui est passé; je me suis contenté de dire à ces messieurs ce dont vous voyes ici l'abregé, d'ailleurs on me regarde trop comme Americain pour ne pas me soupçonner de partialité, et c'est vous, Monsieur le chevalier, qui devés combattre les opinions de Mr. de Valnais et Compagnie.

J'ai passé à travers beaucoup de païs, et vous savés que parmi le peuple d'amerique on ne me regarde aucunement comme etranger. J'ai donc eté à porteé de voir 1'ent. qu'on etoit fort inquiet sur la Seconde division, 2'ent. qu'il etoit politiquement necessaire d'agir cette campagne 3'ent. que les torys repandoient que cette promesse d'une pretendue seconde division etoit un trait d'adresse de la france, 4'ent. que l'on tâche de persuader à tous les Wiggs que la politique de la france est de prolonger la guerre. D'aprés ces observations, Monsieur le chevalier, je n'aime pas que Mr. de Rochambeau paroit si attaché à ce poste de Rhode island, et semble ne songer qu'a la campagne prochaine. Une autre

[94] Fols. 160–162 v.

[95] Lafayette's letter to Rochambeau and de Ternay, of August 9, is printed in Tower, II. 143–149, and in *Mémoires*, I. 345–357. For a general account of the discussion over the proper military policy, *cf.* Perkins, pp. 310–313.

chose qui m'a humilié; c'est que Mr. de Ternay ait refusé *dans tous les cas* de forcer le port de Newyork, et j'ai un peu changé la construction du compte que j'ai rendü à ce sujet. Cette lettre-ci, monsieur le chevalier, ne doit etre qu'entre vous, Mr. de Marbois et moi, et je vous y parle avec toute la franchise de l'amitié. J'ai cru entrevoir que les generaux n'etoient pas pressés d'agir avant qu'une augmentation de forces ne leur donnat de plus grand moyens à leur disposition, et que jusques là, on ne vouloit pas compromettre le peu qui est ici.

Je ne suis pas content de Mr. de Ternay: il n'est aimé ni de la mer ni de la terre; Mr. de Rochambeau est au contraire chéri de l'un et de l'autre. Vous connoissés le caractere, l'esprit, et les talents de ces deux generaux, ainsi je n'ai rien à vous apprendre sur eux. Je desire que Mr. de Rochambeau ait de bons Memoires et qu'il soit convaincu de la necessité d'agir le plutôt possible; je desire aussi qu'il ecrive peu lui-même aux gouverneurs des Etats, qu'il n'ait jamais affaire qu'au G'al Washington; qu'il ne donne d'ordres qu'aux francais, et n'en recoive que du G'al Washington, qu'il soit bien persuadé de la preeminence du pouvoir civil sur le pouvoir militaire. Vous savés combien son ame est honnête et portée au bien; il est très disposé à tout concilier, et je crois que votre correspondance avec lui produira le meilleur effet.

Les deux generaux de terre et de mer s'accordent parfaitement et la raison en est que Mr. de Rochambeau cede toujours à Mr. de Ternay; aux deux chefs prés, la terre et la Marine ne s'aiment pas mieux qu'à l'ordinaire.

La discipline de l'armée e[s]t comme je vous l'ai mandé au-dessus de tout eloge; tous les officiers et soldats sont disposés à entretenir une bonne harmonie avec les Americains, mais leur inaction leur donne beaucoup d'humeur, et les gens de la Cour particulierement se plaignent d'avoir été envoyés pour garder des vaisseaux, ou pour garder une isle dont personne en Amerique ne se soucie.

Je le repete encore, Monsieur le chevalier, il est bien important que nous puissions agir avant la fin de cette campagne. J'attends avec bien de l'impatience l'annonce de la seconde division ou un secours de Mr. de Guichen. Si la superiorité maritime nous arrive avant le quinze septembre, l'objet ne doit pas etre douteux. Si elle arrive plus tard la Georgie et la Caroline desirent nous occuper, et il est, je crois, utile que vous convainquiés d'avance les generaux français de cette verité militaire et politique.

Nous sommes ici, Monsieur le chevalier, fort à portée des ennemis, et ma division legere est trois mille en avant de l'armée. Si Clinton veut se battre, et s'il est battu, ce seroit repondre à beaucoup d'objections sur l'expedition de New York.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, cette lettre-ci est trop intimement particuliere pour que je ne la finisse pas simplement en vous assurant de ma tendre amitié.

LAFAYETTE.

Oserai-je vous demander si vous avés quelque bien bonne occasion pour ecrire en france. Il n'y en a point de sûre a Newport, et le Blocus rend la chose difficile.

Ne pensés vous qu'il seroit à propos d'envoyer sous votre chiffre au Ministre une copie de la lettre ci-jointe?

XXI.

Au Camp de l'infanterie legere ce 15 aoust.[96]

Rien de nouveau, Monsieur le chevalier, et nous n'entendons aucunement parler de la seconde division. J'ai peur qu'il n'y ait eu de nouveaux retards, et toutes les fois qu'on m'en demande des nouvelles, j'avoüe que j'epprouve une veritable souffrance. Dés que vous saurés quelque chose dont vous puissiés tirer quelque vraisemblance, je vous conjure de m'envoyer sur le champ un courier, et vous en promets autant de mon coté.

On dit que Clinton prepare un embarquement, et que deux mille hommes ont receu ordre de s'y disposer. Est-ce une incursion dans le païs qu'ils projettent, ou bien envoyent-ils des troupes au Canada ou à la jamaïque dont il paroit qu'ils connoissent à present le danger ou du moins le plan d'attaque reglé entre les Cours de france et d'espagne.[97] Quelques personnes disent que les ennemis tirent des troupes de Charles town, et se borneront à garrisoner cette place, que nous nous bornerons à prendre si la seconde division arrive trop tard. J'ai vu hier le fort Washington, et vous assure que ce n'est point un ouvrage bien terrible. Je ne'ai receu aucune lettre de Rhode island. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Agreés je vous prie l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

Lafayette.

Voulés vous bien faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois. Vous devriés bien conseiller au Congrés de repondre poliment à notre epitre.

Lf.

XXII.

Au Camp de La division legere ce 18 aoust 1780.[98]

A moins que le sort ne s'en mêle, Monsieur le chevalier, j'espere que vous n'aurés pas desapprouvé ma lettre aux Generaux français,[99] et si j'ai mis par ecrit nos conversations si j'ai hazardé quelques opinions politiques, vous aurés deviné sans peine que dans le premier cas je suivois les ordres, et dans le second le sentiment du General Washington. Les lettres que je joins ici[100] vous montreront qu'on n'est pas content de moi, et celles de mes amis particuliers m'assurent qu'on n'aime ni mes conversations par ecrit ni ma politique, et qu'on me soupçonne en vertu d'un sentiment antipatriotique de deprecier dans ce païs les secours et l'amitié de la france. Tout cela ne laissera pas que de vous paroitre extraordinaire.

Vous verrés par mes reponses[101] que sans avoir tort je demande pardon; je me mettrai même à genoux si l'on veut et je crois que je me laisserai battre; je n'ai pu cependant m'empecher de faire sentir qu'on se trompoit un peu, et si vraiment vous croïés que mes actions, mes idées et mes paroles peuvent s'allier avec quelque espece de patriotisme, je

[96] Fols. 164–164 v. The corps of light infantry was formed by Washington on August 1, and its command given to Lafayette, who joined it on August 7. Its camp was in advance of the main army, whose headquarters on August 16 were at Orangetown. See Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 135, note, and 153.

[97] *Cf.* Doniol, IV. 352, 353.

[98] Fols. 165–166 v.

[99] *I. e.*, letter of August 9, referred to in note 95.

[100] Referring doubtless to his letter from Rochambeau of August 12, printed in *Mémoires*, I. 357; Doniol, V. 363; Tower, II. 151.

[101] Lafayette to Rochambeau and de Ternay, August 18, *Mémoires*, I. 359; same to Rochambeau, August 18, *ibid.*, p. 362; Tower, II. 153.

vous prie de vouloir bien renforcer ma politique par la votre sans cependant faire mention de ma confidence. Quant à moi, je ne me mêlerai plus de politiques, et je suis si persuadé que la confiance et l'amitié de ces messieurs pour moi est necessaire au bien de la chose, que je leur defie de se fâcher, car si je ne suis pas de leur avis, je fermerai la bouche.

Tout ceci, monsieur le chevalier, est plus écrit à mon ami qu'au Ministre du Roy. Je serais au desespoir de mander un mot qui put faire le moindre tort à ces messieurs, particulierement à Versailles. D'ailleurs je suis bien loin de me plaindre d'eux; ils ne savent pas les peines que j'ai pu prendre pour faire valoir leur secours; ils ont imaginé que puisque je leur en mandois tant, j'en disais bien davantage aux Americains; tout cela est fort simple; vous en rirés, et moi, je me suis d'abords mis en colere, j'en rirai aussi à la fin, et je dirai toujours que c'est moi qui ai tort, mais que je n'y reviendrai plus. En attendant, Monsieur le chevalier, j'enrage des questions qu'on me fait sur la seconde division, des inquietudes et des propos que les torys tachent de nourrir, et je ne trouve pas ma position *douce* car je suis sur les épines. Quoique je deprecie les secours de france, n'allés pas me croire un tory.

Je crois, monsieur le chevalier, que les generaux français ont bien besoin d'etre eclairés par vous, et ce n'est pas seulement pour ma justification que je desire les voir recevoir de vous les mêmes *paroles* que je leur ai dites.

Vous aurés appris ce que nous ne savons pas ici officiellement, mais ce que tout le monde mande de Boston au sujet de la flotte de Quebec. On dit qu'un vaisseau de 74 en a pris sept, les Corsaires americains 18, et que les sept autres seront pris par d'autres Corsaires croisant à l'entrée du fleuve St. Laurent.[102]

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Recevés, je vous prie, l'assurance du tendre attachement que mon coeur vous a voué.

LAFAYETTE.

Je vous prie de me renvoyer tous ces griffonages.

XXIII.

AU CAMP DE L'INFANTERIE LEGERE ce 24 aoust 1780.[103]

Bonnes nouvelles, Monsieur le chevalier, la seconde division arrive ou du moins nous avons bien droit de l'esperer. Je ne puis vous dire à quel point je suis heureux, et cependant je n'ose encore me livrer tout à fait à la joie. Un docteur arrive de New hampshire, le docteur a rencontré un ancien officier de notre armée, et plusieurs personnes dignes de foi lequelles lui ont dit, qu'un jour ou deux apres l'Alliance, il est arrivé à Boston un Cutter français qui avoit la laissé, la seconde division, sous le convoy de huit vaisseaux de ligne à la hauteur des Bermudes, et qui venoit savoir dans quel port elle devoit entrer. On a sur le champ expedié deux batiments pour aller à leur rencontre. Quand je vous ai ecrit ce matin, Monsieur le chevalier, j'avois le coeur serré de penser que cette seconde division n'etoit peut-être pas partie, mais à present c'est bien different, et je ne doute presque pas de sa prompte arrivée. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, envoyés moi mes paquets, mandés moi des nouvelles, et permettés moi de vous embraser de tout mon coeur.

LAFAYETTE.

[102] *Cf.* Washington to Heath, August 17, Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 155.

[103] Fols. 167–167 v.

XXIV.

Au Quartier General Liberty Pole ce 24 aoust 1780[104]

Je m'empresse de vous apprendre, Monsieur le chevalier, que l'Alliance—cette fregatte tant desirée est enfin arrivée à Boston, et qu'elle a laissé le port de l'Orient le 6 juillet. Nous savons cette nouvelle par une lettre de Mr. de Rochambeau au general,[105] et par une gazette de Boston qu'il lui a envoyée. On dit que douze vaisseaux etoient bloqués dans le port de Brest par trente deux vaisseaux Anglois, mais que la flotte de Cadix montait à quarante vaisseaux de ligne. Rien de certain sur la seconde division; j'aurois desiré recevoir des lettres de Rhode island, mais n'ayant que la lettre officielle au G'al Washington, je ne puis vous mander que ce qu'elle contient. Il paroit cependant que toutes les depêches vous sont adressées, et aussitôt qu'elles vous arriveront je vous supplie de me faire passer les miennes le plus promptement possible. Si vous m'adressés celles des generaux français, je crois pouvoir soit par la chaine, soit par un homme sûr, les faire arriver fort diligemment a Newport.

L'armée est au *liberty pole*: l'infanterie legere quatre milles en avant, un peu au dessous du fort *Washington*. Je pars cette après midi pour Bergen, et le G'al Greene s'avance avec une partie de l'aile droite pour me soutenir. L'ennemi n'a qu'à passer la Riviere pour nous attaquer, et je porterai une partie de l'avant garde jusques sur la chaussée de paulus hook. On croit qu'il y aura quelque chose à faire, au moins pour l'infanterie legere, mais j'avoüe que je doute fort de voir notre Cartel accepté. Le but principal de ce mouvement est de fourrager toute cette partie. Nous manquons totalement de viande et il y a trois jours que l'armée souffre beaucoup, ce qui, (entre nous) s'attribüe aux paiements en or et aux marchés sans restrictions faits par l'intendant de l'armée française.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je n'ai que le tems de vous assurer de mon tendre attachement.

Lafayette.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, a Monsieur de Marbois.

XXV.

Au Camp de la division legere ce 27 aoust 1780.[106]

Me voici revenu, Monsieur le chevalier, dans mon Camp près du fort *Lee*, et le compte que je vous rendrai de nos operations ne vous paroitra gueres interessant. Notre fourrage sans etre considerable a cependant rapporté quelques bœufs et quelque nourriture pour nos chevaux. Nous avons pendant cette operation offert à l'ennemi un flanc aussi allongé que l'isle de New York, embarrasé de chariots, et formé seulement par l'aisle droite et l'infanterie legere laquelle a fourragé jusqu'au bras de mer qui separe Staten island, et a toujours tenu un Regiment à une portée de fusil des ouvrages de paulus hook. Je vous fais ce detail, Monsieur le chevalier, pour vous prouver combien les ennemis etoient peu disposés à repondre à nos avances. Il est vrai que malgré notre allongement le

104 Fols. 170–171.

105 *Cf.* James Bowdoin to Washington, August 17, 1780, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 60: "Yesterday arrived the frigate *Alliance*, forty days from L'Orient".

106 Fols. 172–173.

general Washington avoit placé tous les corps de son armée de maniere à prevenir tous les cas de danger, et à rendre dans plusieurs autres une action fort desirable.

Mr. Capitaine [*sic*] a été chargé, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous ecrire une apologie pour ma precipitation de l'autre jour. Mon cœur s'est laissé aller à la joie d'une nouvelle qui dans le premier instant me paroissoit sûre, et mon amitié pour vous m'ayant fait desirer que vous la partagiés sur le champ, je me suis trop pressé de vous la faire parvenir.

Nous sommes rentrés cette nuit à notre Camp prés du fort Lee, et je reçois à l'instant un dragon de l'armée avec une lettre du G'al Washington.[107] Je m'empresse, Monsieur le chevalier, de vous l'envoyer; elle vous apprendra le peu de nouvelles que nous savons, et aussitôt que les depêches seront arrivées on ira jour et nuit vous les porter.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse de tout mon cœur, et espere que vous ne doutés pas de mes tendres sentiments pour vous.

Je vous prie de vouloir bien me renvoyer la lettre.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois. Vous devés etre d'autant plus sur de l'exactitude du paragraphe que Mr. de Rochambeau ecrit toujours en anglois quoiqu'il ne l'entende pas.

LF.

XXVI.

AU CAMP DE LA DIVISION LEGERE PRES HAKINSAC, Ce 10 7bre. 1780.[108]

Il y a bien longtems, Monsieur le chevalier, que ja n'ai eû l'honneur de vous ecrire; j'attendois à chaque minute les depêches de l'Alliance, et sans pouvoir comprendre le retard des officiers chargés de nos lettres, je croiois de moment en moment voir arriver celui ou je vous enverrois des paquets de Versailles. Un de ces messieurs a paru enfin hier au soir; mais jugés de mon ettonnement quand j'ai appris qu'il n'avoit de depêches publiques ni pour vous, ni pour moi, ni pour les generaux français. Mr. de Vauban[109] s'est presenté à M. Landais[110] avec toutes les lettres ministerielles; il avoit même, assure-t-on, un ordre de M. de Sartine; toutes les nouvelles particulieres de fraiche datte etoient egalement en ses mains. Eh bien Mons. Landais n'a pas voulu de lui, et ses paquets ainsy que sa personne sont sur la côte europeenne.

L'Alliance ne nous porte que deux mille fusils, de la poudre et quant aux habits il n'y en a pas un seul à son bord. Paul Jones devoit suivre avec l'Ariel, mais il manquoit de matelots, et la fureur de croiser le retardera surement. D'ailleurs il ne peut point porter d'habillements, et

[107] This letter is not among the Washington Papers in the Library of Congress.

[108] Fols. 179–181 v., L. S.

[109] Comte de Vauban, aide-de-camp to Rochambeau. Balch, II. 244.

[110] Pierre de Landais, former lieutenant in the French navy, later a captain in the navy of the United States, in command of the *Alliance*. In June 1780, the command of the *Alliance* having been given to Jones, by Franklin, Landais succeeded, at the instigation of Arthur Lee, in disaffecting the crew (Jones was absent in Paris) and sailed from L'Orient with Lee, but without the clothing and supplies which were to have been sent by the *Alliance*. During the voyage his conduct was so erratic that his officers took the command away from him. He was court-martialed and dismissed from the Navy. Allen, *Naval History of the American Revolution*, II. 482, 525.

nous ne les verrons qu'avec la seconde division. Le President du Congrés m'ayant envoyé quelques lettres arrivées par un vaisseau marchand, j'y ai trouvé une depêche chiffrée de M. de Vergennes, et je m'empresse de vous en faire passer la copie; vous y verrés que le ministere n'etoit pas pressé d'envoyer la seconde division, mais que cependant nous devons l'esperer dans l'automne; vous y verrés qu'ils n'ont pas de notions fraiches sur les inconvenients actuels d'avoir ici tel ou tel nombre de troupes, lesquelles dans les circonstances presentes ma politique porteroit, mais aussi borneroit à huit ou neuf mille hommes effectifs. Vous y verrés qu'on attend beaucoup de nous et qu'on veut nous voir agir, mais on n'oublie pas, j'espere l'article maritime sans lequel vous savés qu'il n'y a pas d'esperance. Il seroit bien interessant, je crois, d'ecrire bien tost au gouvernement et de demander des vaisseaux, de la poudre, quelques hommes, et avec la permission de Mr. Necker, de l'argeant article essentiel.

L'officier arrivant de france dit qu'à son depart le Port de Brest etoit bloqué par 28 vaisseaux Anglois, que nous avions quatorze vaisseaux dans le port; que l'on en avoit rassemblé trente trois à Cadix que la seconde division convoyée par 3 ou 5 vaisseaux etoit prête, que depuis quelques jours les anglais croisoient fort au large. Je n'ai pas encore eû l'honneur de vous ecrire sur la resolution prise par les etats de l'Est et je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire le plaisir qu'elle m'a fait, mais vous savés que nous avons besoin d'etre pressés, et j'espere que votre influence facilitera l'arrangement et en pressera l'execution avant que nos recrues de six mois nous abandonnent. Il est bien important d'avoir une armée pour la guerre et ce dernier article qui ne peut s'obtenir que par *drafts* me paroit d'une necessité absolue. Il ne l'est pas moins de prendre des mesures pour nourrir notre armée, qui vit du jour à la journée, qui manque à tous moments, qui au milieu d'un païs abondant epprouve le supplice de tantale, et qui sans magazins ne peut songer à aucune expedition eloignée; rendre au Congres les pouvoirs dont il s'est dessaisi sans savoir pourquoi; y ajouter ceux sans lesquels les etats seront desunis deux ans apres la paix; et former sur une base solide une etroite Confederation à laquelle je crois l'alliance française reunie, voila, Monsieur le Chevalier, quelles sont les intentions de quelques patriotes dans l'est. Sans ces precieuses demarches, il n'y a point de salut pour nous, et je compte bien sur vous pour en determiner et pour en hâter l'effet.

En consequence de la demande faite par les G'aux français, le G'al Washington s'est determiné à quitter son armée et à leur proposer une entrevue à Hartfort.[111] C'est le Vingt que nous y serons rendus, et il seroit, je crois, bien utile à la chose publique que vous puissies quitter aussi votre residence. C'est pour cela que je m'empresse de vous faire part du tems de notre voyage, mais si vous n'y venés pas, Monsieur le chevalier, je desire bien que vous ecriviés aux generaux français pour les determiner vers le Sud, et que vous leur fassiés sentir que notre position n'est pas asses *douce* pour ne pas travailler à nous tirer au plus vite d'embaras. Si nous obtenons la superiorité maritime il me paroit que l'armée française a fait prendre icy des informations sur le Canada, mais quoique si nous n'allons pas au Sud, cette expedition sera la seule proposée et possible, j'aimerois bien mieux les carolines.

Il me paroit, Monsieur le Chevalier, que la vitesse du cheval de notre ami Gates n'a pas laissé que de nuire à la perfection de ses informations et si l'on en croit le Gouverneur Jefferson la fatale defaite düe je pense

111 Washington to Rochambeau, September 8, in Ford, *Writings*, VIII. 427.

au mauvais et anti-militaire ordre de la bataille, nous a cependant permis de sauver quelques troupes.[112] Je ne sais qui l'on enverra presentement en Caroline mais j'espere qu'on rapellera le G'al Gates et que l'armée combinée ira dans quelques mois reparer nos malheurs.

Quelques personnes disent, Monsieur le chevalier, qu'on va faire le G'al Washington dictateur. Je ne sais ni si comme son ami je dois le desirer pour lui, mais je sais tres certainement que je ne dois n'y en parler ni même avoir l'air de souhaiter cette mesure, laquelle cependant me paroit infiniment importante. D'apres ce que m'ont temoigné les ministres français je suis bien sure qu'ils seroient charmés d'avoir à traiter leurs operations avec le General. Quant à vous, Monsieur le chevalier, je n'ai pas besoin de vous demander ce que vous en pensés. C'est alors que la France preteroit l'argeant necessaire pour faire vivre, peut-etre pour payer l'armée et elle seroit sûre de voir ces emprunts bien employés etca., etca. Mes principes republicains et même entierement democratiques devroient me faire opposer à une pareille mesure aussi ne l'approuverois-je pas si je ne connoissois l'homme; et si je ne croïois pas le dictatorat necessaire au salut publique.

Quant aux nouvelles particulieres je vous dirai que la C'tesse Jules est accouchée d'un garcon, que Mr. le Prince de Condé est Colonel General de l'Infanterie, que Mr. le Prince de Montbarrey est grand d'Espagne (voila deux princes bien contents) que M. le Duc Dayen[113] a la toison d'or, qu'on a fait une nuée de mestres de Camp (car c'est Mestre de Camp qu'on s'appelle à present), que tout Paris court apres Paul Jones, et que pendant ce tems-la nos habits restent sur la plage.

Adieu, Monsieur le Chevalier, agrées l'assurance du tendre attachement avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'etre

Votre tres humble
et obeissant serviteur
LAFAYETTE.

XXVII.

AU QUARTIER GENERAL Ce 17 Septembre 1780.[114]

Depuis quelque tems, Monsieur le chevalier, nous sommes livrés à toutes les vicissitudes d'esperance et de crainte. L'arrivée de Mr. de Guichen nous est annoncée de tant de cotés qu'il est difficile de ne pas y ajouter foi. Hier nous avons appris que l'amiral Rodney etoit arrivé devant Sandy hook avec treize vaisseaux,[115] et que se joignant à Arbuthnot il allait ou attendre Mr. de Guichen ou de concert avec le G'al Clinton entreprendre contre Rhode island. Apres une nuit peu tranquille on me dit ce matin que les vaisseaux en question sont entrées dans le hook, et d'aprés cette nouvelle nous avons lieu d'esperer que le pretendu Rodney n'est que l'amiral Arbuthnot se cachant dans le port de Newyork. Si cela est ainsi, nous osons encore nous flatter que la grande expedition est possible.

Nous pouvons avoir environ douze mille continentaux; Mr. de Guichen a, dit-on, trois mille hommes; Mr. de Rochambeau, quatre. Nous rassemblerons dix mille miliciens. Quant aux provisions nous emploierons la

[112] Battle of Camden, August 16. See Jefferson to Washington, September 3, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 73.

[113] Lafayette's father-in-law.

[114] Fols. 182–183 v.

[115] Rodney arrived at New York on September 12.

force et pour une telle occasion le peuple ne le trouvera pas mauvais. S'il est possible à Mr. de Guichen de forcer le port de Newyork notre expedition est sure; s'il maintient la superiorité maritime hors du port, elle est encore possible. Voilà du moins mon opinion particuliere, mais le port est le point interessant.

Si notre pavillon regne ici et que New-York ne soit pas attaqué, il faut absolument aller au sud, et vous serés bien de mon avis. Nous partons à l'instant pour Hartfort, ou nous verrons les generaux français. J'aurois bien voulu que vous y fussies non seulement pour avoir le plaisir de vous voir, mais pour des motifs de nature publique. Je n'ai pas receu de reponse à ce que j'avois l'honneur de vous mander à ce sujet. Le C'l'el Tilmangh[116] qui reste ici s'est chargé de me faire parvenir vos lettres en toute diligence. J'ai bien envie que ces messieurs connoissent par vous notre situation. Quoique un peu plus tranquille depuis ce matin, je suis encore bien inquiet sur cette nouvelle de Rodney. Si la jonction de nos escadres est faite, je serai au moins rassuré sur les malheurs. Mr. de Guichen sera egal, et, prejugés à part, je crois que délors il est superieur d'autant mieux qu'en cas d'evenement sa retraite est meilleure.

S'il y a la moindre nouvelle à ce sujet, j'ai charge le C'l'el Tilmangh de vous ecrire sur le champ. Mr. de Pontgibault[117] n'avoit pour vous qu'un paquet remis par un marchand, et qui lui a été peu recommendé; il l'a mis à la poste le lendemain de son arrivée, mais je ne l'en ai pas moins grondé. Les lettres des Ministres etoient dans les mains de Mr. de Vauban. Mais Landais a dit qu'il ne connoissoit pas ces Messieurs-là.

Oserois-je vous prier de dire à Mr. de Loyauté[118] que si je ne lui reponds pas sur le champ, c'est pour tâcher de faire une reponse favorable, ce dont je doute bien vu nos circonstances. Mr. de Galvan[119] est dans ma division legere et paroit content; je le suis infiniment de lui.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, agrées l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois

XXVIII.

AU CAMP PRÈS CRANESTOWN, ce 28 octobre 1780.[120]

Ma lettre au G'al Washington, Monsieur le chevalier, est arrivée au quartier géneral au moment ou vous partiés, et auroit du lui parvenir

[116] Tench Tilghman, of Pennsylvania, lieutenant-colonel, aide-de-camp and military secretary to General Washington. Heitman, p. 543.

[117] Comte de Moré, chevalier de Pontgibaud, aide-de-camp to Lafayette. Balch, II. 202. See also the *Mémoires* of Pontgibaud.

[118] Anne-Philippe-Dieudonné de Loyauté, inspector general of artillery and of fortifications in Virginia. Balch, II. 170.

[119] De Galvan was a French volunteer officer, *ibid.*, 132.

[120] Fols. 190–191. Between September 17, the date of the preceding letter, and October 28, the date of this letter, the Hartford conference between Washington and Rochambeau had been held, September 20–22, and Arnold's treason had been discovered. For the Hartford conference see Doniol, IV. 404, where the proposals of Rochambeau and de Ternay are printed, together with Washington's replies. Lafayette's letter to Luzerne of September 25, containing an account of the Arnold affair, is printed in Tower, II. 164–168.

plutôt. Je doutois si peu qu'elle vous y trouvat que je n'ai pas cru devoir rien envoyer à Morris town. D'ailleurs ma piteuse avanture ne valoit pas la peine de vous ecrire.[121]

Tout nous favorisoit, Monsieur le chevalier, espions, guides, brouillard, tout etoit pour nous. Les troupes pleines d'ardeur et marchant avec le plus admirable silence etoient arrivées au moment precis. Mais un seul article ne dependoit ni d'elles ni de moi, et cet article a manqué par la bêtise ou la negligence du triste porteur de lunette l'ami Picquerin;[122] les batteaux sont arrivés trop tard, et malgré les relais que par excés de precaution j'avois envoyé sur la route j'ai vu que le jour me viendroit dejouer avant mon arrivée aux ennemis, et qu'une surprise aisée se changeroit en un sanglant assaut ou je perdrois plus de braves soldats que je ne prendrois d'ennemis. J'ai donc resté tristement à Elizabeth town et suis revenu hier dans mon camp de Cranes town. A la maniere dont l'etat Major de notre armée est arrangé, le general et ceux des officiers generaux qu'il honore de sa confiance ont quatre fois plus de peines et de petits details que dans les autres services, et finissent par manquer les operations par des contretems qui ne dependent pas d'eux.

Mr. Düer[123] de l'etat de Newyork m'ayant ecrit pour proposer aux français un marché de farine j'ai envoyé la lettre à Mr. de Rochambeau pour qu'il la soumette aux lumieres de Mr. Tarlet,[124] et qu'il fasse de la proposition ce qu'il jugera convenable. J'ai une lettre de Mr. de Marbois pour vous enfermée dans un portefeuille que je ne peux pas avoir à present et que je vous enverrai par la premiere occasion. Voulés vous bien lui faire mes compliments et lui montrer la copie de ma lettre au gouvernement.

Le Major Lee[125] va dans le sud; vous deviés bien conseiller au Congrés de lui donner une legion de deux cent chevaux et trois cent hommes d'infanterie. Elle sera de la plus grande utilité, et le Major Lee est sans comparaison le meilleur officier de troupes legeres qu'il y ait dans les armées Angloises, hessoises, ou americaines sur le Continent.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, Agrées l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE.

Il y a dans les papiers de New York une dissertation sur l'alliance de la france avec l'amerique. Comme je voudrois que les ennemis en fissent souvent, car elle n'est pas brillament raisonnée.

[121] The "piteuse aventure" referred to in this and in the succeeding paragraph was the attempted attack on Staten Island by Lafayette's light infantry. *Cf.* Lafayette to Washington, October 30, in Tower, II. 172, and Washington to Lafayette, in Ford, *Writings*, IX. 17.

[122] Timothy Pickering, at this time quartermaster general of the Continental Army.

[123] William Duer?

[124] De Tarlé was commissary in Rochambeau's staff. Balch, II. 235.

[125] Henry Lee—"Light Horse Harry".

(*To be continued.*)

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity (based on the Arthaśâstra of Kauṭilya). By NARENDA NATH LAW, M.A., B.L. With an introductory essay on the Age and Authenticity of the Arthasâstra of Kauṭilya by Professor RADHAKUMUD MOOKERJI, M.A. Volume I. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xlv, 203.)

OUR knowledge of the internal affairs of Hindu government has until recently been based upon two sources, first the accounts given by the Greeks, notably by Megasthenes, second by the Hindu law-books and works of polity, *Nītiçāstra*, some of which go back to a period several centuries prior to the Christian era, but all of which are suspected of being rather ideal than practical. A few years ago the text of the *Arthaçāstra* was discovered. This work professes to be the composition of a certain Kautilya or Chānakya, the minister of Chandra Gupta, who reigned in the fourth century B. C. It appears to be, as Professor Mookerji calls it, "a unique record of the secular and practical activities and achievements of the Hindu genius", and as such is of peculiar interest.

Immediately on the appearance of the text a controversy arose among scholars in regard to its authenticity. In any event it was recognized as an important contribution to the subjects discussed in the law-books, such as the machinery of administration, courts of justice, laws of contract, sales, etc., especially as it treated of other matters scarcely touched upon in the formal *Dharmaçāstra*, such as the best method of handling live stock, keeping up means of communication, mining, irrigation, etc. But it was questioned whether this admittedly ancient treatise was really the work of Vishnugupta, Chānakya, or Kautilya, as its reputed author is variously named, or the work of a school based perhaps on the precepts of Kautilya but not actually from his hand.

In the introduction, Mr. Mookerji pleads for the former hypothesis, supporting the thesis of Professor Jacobi, as opposed to the latter hypothesis advocated by Professor Hillebrandt, who argues that the treatise is the work of a later school based on Kautilya's maxims. It does not appear to us that Professor Mookerji has proved his point. On the contrary, having ignored the evidence furnished by the law-books he has overlooked the fact that where the Kautilyan work agrees most closely with these books it agrees with the provisions of the later rather than with those of the earlier law. Moreover, the work itself recognizes the

later zenana system, which is not an early Hindu custom, and Professor Mookerji's citation from Açoka's Rock Edict, apparently recognizing this custom of keeping women housed in a harem, is of no avail, since the Rock Edict is not now so interpreted.

But the *Arthaçāstra* in any case is a mine of information concerning the administration of an ancient Hindu kingdom and that it reflects actual conditions may be seen from a comparison of the work with Megasthenes's notes and the life depicted in the Hindu epics. It tells how a king should live, describes his arduous days and nights, in which he examines accounts, studies, receives revenues, hears trials, discusses military affairs, etc. It explains the system of spies and government through minor officials; specifies the royal monopolies, salt, timber, horses, etc., the duties of the king in regard to widows and orphans, the duties of each overseer, of navigation, agriculture, forests, commerce, plays and gambling-halls, weights and measures; and gives details as to the collection of the census, the width of roads, breeds of horses, and even as to the milking of cows, the wages of cowherds, etc. Mr. Law's first volume treats of mining, irrigation, meteorology, live stock, game, forests, roads, works of public utility, the census, and courts of justice. A succeeding volume will discuss the machinery of administration. An interesting feature is the method of citation, quotations being made always in the original Sanskrit text (and alphabet) and not always translated, though occasionally the Sanskrit is transliterated. Readers may however accept the translation as usually literal and exact, despite an occasional freedom implying more than the original, as when the royal seal (on carrier-pigeons) is translated "passport". We know of no other work giving so complete an idea of the original as that of Mr. Law and can recommend it to all students of Oriental history. The text itself has been before the public so short a time that it has hardly been utilized at all except by Mr. Barnett in his recently published *Antiquities of India* and in critical studies by various German scholars in philological journals.

E. Washburn Hopkins.

Studi Siciliani ed Italioti. Por L. Pareti. Volume I. Contributi alla Scienza dell' Antichità pubblicati da G. De Sanctis e L. Pareti. (Florence: B. Seeber. 1914. Pp. 356.)

The Turin school of ancient history gave a notable proof of its corporate existence not long since by publishing a collection of studies in memory of Emilio Pozzi, whose career, already rich in achievement but richer still in promise, had been brought to an exceedingly untimely close by a fall in the Roman Forum. Its founder, De Sanctis, and one of its leading members, Pareti of Florence, have now inaugurated with the volume under review a new series of books designed to receive "works in the field of antiquity of a strictly scientific character, which, because of their extent, are ill adapted for insertion among the articles

of periodicals and the memoirs of academies". It is not for an American to gauge the need in Italy of an additional medium for the publication of such things. He may simply note the fact that with the same end in view Beloch has long since been editing his well-known *Studi di Storia Antica,* and that Païs has admitted to his *Studi Storici* articles perilously like those united in the first volume of the new venture. And he may add the comment that the conditions which have dowered us in America with innumerable *Studies in Classical Philology,* etc., are evidently not unknown in Italy, the most obvious, but perhaps merely apparent, divergence being that, whereas with us the university is the organizing agent, in Italy it is the active professor who appears in that rôle.

Academic and professional rivalries do not, however, suffice to account for the present series, nor does it spring solely from the highly commendable energy and resourcefulness of its editors: we have to recognize in it another manifestation of the keen interest which modern Italy is coming to take in the scientific investigation of its national beginnings. In this first volume Pareti deals exclusively with Sicily and Magna Graecia. Of the twelve articles it contains, eight are entirely new. They are now offered, together with the four elsewhere published, as *prolegomena* to a new synthesis which the author leads us to expect he may some day make of the early history of southern Italy.

The first article in the book is a chronological study tending to extend the enterprise of Dorieus in western Sicily over the period from 510 to about 490 B. C., and to make it one of the remote causes of the Carthaginian attack in 479 B. C.; the second makes the tyranny of Gelon begin, not as is commonly believed, at Syracuse, but at Gela, in 485 B. C.; the third holds that it was Anaxilas of Rhegium, whose stock was Messenian, who, on conquering Zankle in 485 B. C., changed its name to Messene; the fourth describes, on the basis of his new chronology, the Sicilian antecedents of the battle of Himera; the fifth sustains the thesis that "the poet Theognis, a native of Megara Hyblaea, was still writing in Sicily during the first two decades of the fifth century—until Gelon in 482 B. C. mastered his home—and later on, in Greece at Megara Nisaea at about 480-479 B.C."; the sixth, which seems to us to be one of the most valuable, dates the campaign of Hamilcar in 479 B. C., traces the rise of the legend which made the battle simultaneous with Salamis or Thermopylae, and treats *à la* Kromayer the strategy, tactics, and *terrain* of the encounter. This last service is done in number eight for the campaign of Himilco and Dionysius around Gela in 405 B. C., and shows that after the destruction of this city by the Mamertini in 282 B. C. the site was never again occupied, but that the Γελῷοι continued to exist under their old name in their new city Phintias. The arguments used in the ninth article to prove that the gods of Selinus were derived *via* its metropolis Megara Hyblaea from Megara Nisaea—as is indeed altogether probable—would, we think, prove

equally well that they were derived from Athens, Corinth, or any other normal Greek city. In number ten, which appears also in *Rivista di Filologia,* 1914, pp. 49 ff., Pareti routs Païs, horse, foot, and artillery, in his attempt to derive from Strabo's etymology of the name Rhegium (VI. 1, 6, p. 258c) far-reaching conclusions both as to the sources of the geographer and as to the Romanization of Italian cities. Number eleven, on the chronology of the first Greek colonies in Sicily, operates with too many unproven assumptions to yield convincing conclusions.

Of the work as a whole we take pleasure in certifying that it displays abundance of acumen, knowledge, and sound method. If it is marred by anything it is by the Italian love of prolonged ratiocination.

W. S. Ferguson.

Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique Celtique et Gallo-Romaine. Par Joseph Déchelette, Conservateur du Musée de Roanne, Correspondant de l'Institut. Tome II., *Archéologie Celtique ou Protohistorique.* Troisième partie. *Second Âge du Fer ou Époque de la Tène.* (Paris: Auguste Picard. 1914. Pp. viii, 911–1683, plates xiii.)

It is not necessary to repeat here what has been said in review of M. Déchelette's earlier volumes by way of general commendation of his work; nor is there any occasion to qualify the judgments already expressed. The substantial volume now published displays the same thorough and comprehensive scholarship as its predecessor.

It deals with the second Iron Age, or La Tène epoch, which is now generally held to extend from about 500 B. C. to the beginning of the Christian era. This was the period during which the Celtic peoples attained the height of their power and influence in Europe, and on account of the La Tène culture is consequently a description of Celtic civilization in some of its most characteristic phases. Indeed, since Celtic literature is all of much later date, and since the information furnished by classical writers is meagre at best, archaeology is the main resource of the historian in reconstructing the world of the independent Continental Celts.

M. Déchelette finds that the culture of the late iron epoch had its centre in the region about the middle Rhine. From this focal point it was widely disseminated by Celtic emigration and conquests, and was even taken over by Germans and Scandinavians outside the range of Celtic rule. It was developed under Graeco-Roman influence, and in showing the relations of the two civilizations M. Déchelette lays special stress on the influence of industry and commerce. He argues strongly (pp. 914 ff., 1574 ff.), in opposition to what has been a prevalent opinion, that the products of southern arts and crafts found on Celtic soil were brought there largely through peaceful exchange and not as prize of battle. In this volume, as in those which precede it, he gives special

consideration to the question of trade-routes, and concludes that the southern influence, at least in the first part of the La Tène epoch, came rather by way of the Po and the Alps than from Marseilles. The site of La Tène itself, from which the archaeological period derives its name, he holds to have been a "station de péage" and not, as has been commonly supposed, a military stronghold.

It is of course useless to attempt to summarize here the archaeological facts set forth in some seven hundred pages. But a few of the author's opinions or conclusions may be briefly mentioned. Many observations, as might be expected, are made on the subject of Celtic religion. In the discussion of burials considerations of interest are presented concerning the belief in transmigration and some evidence is collected with regard to the practice of human sacrifice. The chapter on amulets and other talismans supplies abundant materials illustrative of the superstitions of the people. In the discussion of trade and commerce (pp. 1529 ff.) a somewhat hazardous theory is proposed which derives from Italy and the south the veneration of the number three, usually regarded hitherto as particularly characteristic of the Celts. Perhaps the most important historical conclusions in the volume relate to the general character of the Celtic civilization and nationality at the time of the rather shadowy "imperium Celticum". Some of M. Déchelette's earliest archaeological studies had to do with the comparison of the *oppidum* of Bibracte in Gaul with that of Stradonitz in Bohemia; and in the second chapter of the present volume he sets forth the results of these and similar investigations, which show a striking unity of culture throughout a wide Celtic area. The evidence of archaeology is confirmed, he argues, by the testimony of place-names and by the statements of the ancient historians; and he suggests that the Celtic domination during the second and third centuries before Christ was an actual forerunner of the "unité romaine" of a later age.

F. N. Robinson.

Jewish History and Literature under the Maccabees and Herod. By B. H. Alford. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1913. Pp. xvi, 113.)

In 1910 Mr. Alford published a volume entitled *The Old Testament History and Literature*, discussing the canonical and deutero-canonical books and those parts of Ethiopic Enoch (i.–xxxvi., lxxii.–xc.) that, in his judgment, were written before 135 B. C. The present volume is a continuation dealing with Jewish history and literature during the following 125 years down to the birth of Jesus which is dated in 10 B. C. The author sketches briefly the history of the Hasmonaean dynasty, the Roman rule until the accession of Herod, and the reign of this king. He also gives a summary of the contents of such works as the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Tobit and Judith (only touched

upon in the former volume), Ethiopic Enoch, xci.–cviii. and xxxvii.–lxx., and the Wisdom of Solomon. Two pages at the end refer to the "Magnificat" of Mary, the "Benedictus" of Zacharias, and the "Nunc Dimittis" of Simeon, evidently because they are regarded as coming from the time of Herod, though later than the birth of Jesus. The book is in no sense a fresh contribution to our knowledge of the period. It presents no new facts, no independent treatment of the material already known, no new points of view. Mr. Alford uses the translations and commentaries of a few English scholars, and accepts their opinions without a question. Such a popular account no doubt has its value, as it may help to give a general idea of a deeply interesting period of Jewish history to persons unfamiliar with its leading events and literary productions. There are many such, since the Protestant Bible Societies no longer publish the deutero-canonical books and the Roman Catholic Church has no interest in printing for public use the books it designates as Apocrypha. It is to be feared that the admirable collection edited by Charles under the title *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913) and the excellent description of this literature by Székely in his *Bibliotheca Apocrypha* (Freiburg, 1913) will be chiefly used by scholars and fail to reach the general public, the former because of its heavy price, the latter because it is written in Latin.

So far as the historic sketches in Mr. Alford's book are concerned they are in the main well drawn. There are some debatable or incorrect statements. Thus there is no evidence that Zerubbabel was sent to Judaea as governor in 537 B. C., that the Hasidaeans became Pharisees, or that "the Jews expected a Messiah from among the Hasmonaeans". The notion of a fixed canon to which books were gradually added dies hard. Mr. Alford thinks that the text of Zechariah vi., may have been changed so as to make "the Branch" apply as a title to the High Priest alone, "when the Book of Zechariah was added to the Canon of Scripture". That Jethro was an example of the union of priestly and royal functions in the same person is an idea that might easily have become popular in the period which found Melchizedek so useful, if only the Pentateuch had anywhere suggested that Jethro was a king. In view of the fact that Palestine was a part of the Ptolemaic kingdom until 200 B. C. it seems extremely improbable that "the earliest approach of Hellenism was from the side of Antioch".

But these matters are of slight importance compared with the questions raised by Mr. Alford's treatment of the literature. A reader of his book gets the impresson that it is pretty accurately known when these documents were written and just what parts belonged to them in their original form, while the truth, of course, is that we do not know with certainty the date of a single piece of writing assigned to this period, and there is no real consensus of opinion among scholars even in regard to the most important. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that theories as to composition and date based solely on internal evidence must be

taken with great caution. In a popular work it is necessary to indicate the tentative nature of all such scientific conjectures, though it may be thought needless in a learned treatise, since the specialist generally knows how to discount scholastic assurance and assertion. To take one striking illustration: Following Charles, Mr. Alford places the Parables of Enoch before the Psalms of Solomon in the beginning of the first century B. C. This work exists only in Ethiopic. We do not know whether there ever was a Greek translation of this particular book, and the absence of any quotation from it in patristic literature renders it extremely doubtful. Many peculiarities of language point to an Aramaic original. That it passed through Christian hands is certain. The three terms rendered into English "The Son of Man" correspond to three Aramaic terms, two of which are clearly of Christian origin. It is well-nigh impossible that such expressions as "the kings and the mighty ones in the earth", who "worship the work of their own hands", can refer to Alexander Jannaeus and his Sadducean supporters. All scholars admit that the work has been interpolated by many copyists and some of these seem to have been Christians. There is no binding evidence by which even the original Jewish form of the Parables can be brought back further than to the reign of Caligula. Where so much is in doubt it is extremely unwise to base far-reaching conclusions as to the existence in Jewish thought before the appearance of Christianity of certain ideas expressed in the Ethiopic text of this work. The same criticisms apply to the dating of other literary productions of the period, the tentative character of which should have been indicated. Mr. Alford does not discuss the interesting work published by Schechter in 1910 dealing with the Covenanters of Damascus. Their hope of a Messiah "from Aaron and Israel" deserved to be mentioned.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

Cicero of Arpinum: a Political and Literary Biography, being a Contribution to the History of Ancient Civilization and a Guide to the Study of Cicero's Writings. By E. G. SIHLER, Ph.D., Professor of the Latin Language and Literature, New York University. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xi, 487.)

THE manysidedness of Cicero's character and his great versatility make the writing of his life a very difficult matter. His biographer must be qualified to discuss not only his personal qualities, his political career, and his place among the world's orators, but he must also be able to estimate the value of his rhetorical and philosophical treatises and to appreciate his skill as a letter-writer. It is high praise, therefore, to say that Professor Sihler has covered all these subjects, and has covered them well. His book gives us an account of Cicero's life which is unbiassed, comprehensive, and in the main accurate. With his general

estimate of Cicero's character, and of his attitude toward Caesar, Pompey, Crassus, Cato, and Octavius, the reviewer is in hearty accord. He would have to disagree with the author on a few minor points, such as his conception of the judicial reforms of Drusus (p. 15), and his understanding of the military post held by Cicero in 49 B. C. (*cf.* p. 303).

Cicero is kept constantly before our eyes. The book is a life of him, as it should be, not the story of his life and times. This method of treatment, however, makes it impossible to go into a number of puzzling questions which we should like to have more fully discussed. Cases in point are the real purpose of Metellus Nepos (pp. 170 f.), the conspiracy of Vettius (pp. 200 f.), the exact nature of the Clodian legislation against Cicero, which is very inadequately discussed on pages 205–206 (*cf.* pp. 212 and 219), and the wisdom from the military and political points of view of Pompey's evacuation of Italy and of his plan to starve the peninsula into submission. Of the strictly Ciceronian material we should like a fuller account of the anti-Cato episode, of that side of Cicero's character which comes out in his relations with young men, and a discussion of his poetry, which deserves consideration from the standpoint of technique at least.

The form is annalistic, and in the latter part of the book as much of the story as possible is told in extracts translated from Cicero's letters. At certain points the narrative is broken by discursive passages, printed in smaller type, dealing with the sources or giving excellent analyses and estimates of the orations and treatises. The style is very effective. Over the short, vigorous sentences, for instance, in which the Catilinarian story is told there is little danger that the reader's attention will flag, but it is unfortunate that the author's pages have so many blemishes in the way of misprints, and loose and unidiomatic expressions. We have come upon these misprints: "citizen" for citizens (p. 28); "a MSS." (p. 72); "later" for latter (p. 90); "G." for C. (p. 127); "S. C. Ultimatum" (p. 181); "six hundred hence" for six hundred years hence (p. 194), and "fuzzy" for fussy (p. 287). We can give here only a few illustrations of the many unidiomatic or awkward phrases which have fallen under our notice in reading the book: "branch of race" (p. 55); "a programme of action, which while widely apart" (p. 156); "independent from Livy" (p. 202); "one could insinuate one's self to Cicero" (p. 195); "stung with the point of a sharp instrument" (pp. 196–197); "these news" (p. 212); "it" and "herself" of the same subject (pp. 57–58); "here probably . . . there was at first perhaps" (p. 128); "Atticus had talked with Balbus at Rome, whether there was" etc. (p. 319). Many of the translations should also be recast, *cf.*, *e.g.*, page 174. When these defects are removed, the book will be not only one of the most trustworthy and comprehensive biographies of Cicero which we have, but one of the most readable.

Frank Frost Abbott.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III. By SYDNEY KNOX MITCHELL, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Yale College. [Yale Historical Publications, Studies, II.] (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xiii, 407.)

THIS work contains the first detailed account of those taxes of the thirteenth century, the receipts from which made up the king's extraordinary revenue. None of the previous writers on medieval taxation having attempted such a description as Dr. Mitchell has given us, his work marks a long step in advance towards adequate knowledge of the field he has covered.

The method of treatment in the first nine chapters, three-fourths of the work, is rigidly chronological. Under the dates of their grant or imposition is given a full account of "the dona on religious houses, the tallage, the scutage levied in connection with campaigns, and the aids, under which term are grouped three levies: the aid on knights' fees, called also scutage, the carucage, and the tax on personal property" (p. 9). In each case the history of the tax is traced from its grant until it reached the central government. The final chapter contains the author's conclusions, and a study of the effect of taxation upon the development of corporate unity among the baronage.

The scutage receives a full and satisfactory treatment. The accounts of the separate levies are based upon a wide reading of the printed sources and of the manuscript records in the Public Record Office. It seems to be proved that the scutage retained its character as a composition for service, though it was not the only composition, throughout the period of this study. The establishment of this fact is a distinct contribution to our knowledge. The few instances of its use as a general tax are carefully differentiated from the normal levy. The accounts of the levies of the carucage and tallage are less detailed. The generally received opinion that the carucage was levied upon the land and not upon the plough receives added confirmation. The treatment of the tallage is rather meagre at times (pp. 220, 249–250, 256) when its importance as a source of revenue is considered. It would seem that it might have been possible to have given some details concerning the amounts paid by the towns, in order that an idea of the development of the tax might be gained.

Though the descriptions of the taxes upon movables are by far the best that have been published, they suffer from the lack of a thorough examination of the manuscript records. The results of such an examination would have materially changed but a few of the author's statements, yet they would have thrown much light upon the formal precepts issued by the government. The writs issued to the justices in charge of the assessment of the subsidy of 1225 describe only the property which was

to be exempted from taxation (p. 164). There are, however, two local assessment rolls preserved (Exchequer Lay Subsidies 242/47, 242/127) which contain accurate information concerning the movables that were taxed. The summary of the accounts rendered by the collectors of the subsidy of 1232 (L. T. R. Foreign Accounts, Roll 1, m. 6) throws a flood of light upon the system of exemption and separate payment. For neither of the subsidies have these records been utilized and there are similar omissions elsewhere.

There are many repetitions in the first part of the work, due to the method of treatment and, therefore, to be pardoned. The style is rather dry. On every page, however, there is evidence of a mastery of most of the pertinent original material. Though neither in purpose nor in result a book for the general reader, it is a very valuable guide to the taxes of the thirteenth century.

James F. Willard.

Roger Bacon Essays. Contributed by various Writers on the Occasion of the Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Birth. Collected and edited by A. G. Little. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. Pp. 425.)

Fourteen essays are contributed by as many scholars from various fields of natural science, mathematics, medicine, literature, linguistics, philosophy, palaeography, and artillery. An appendix of fifty pages gives in revised form the bibliography of Bacon's writings published by Mr. Little in 1911. There is no index. Of the essays, four are written in German; two in French; one, by an American, Professor David Eugene Smith. Of the contributors five have been or are engaged in editing Bacon's writings; others have previously published books or articles concerning him; others are authors of general histories of the departments of learning to which they now estimate Bacon's contributions or relations.

"One is liable", writes Professor Smith, "to be led away by enthusiasm when writing upon the occasion of the seven hundredth anniversary of any great leader, to read into his works what is not there, and to ascribe to him abilities which he never possessed" (p. 182). This tendency, however, most of the essayists have successfully resisted; and, while there is a certain amount of the eulogy inevitable upon such an occasion, one lays down the volume convinced that its authors have damned Roger Bacon with faint praise, and that his reputation, like Pyrrhus's army, will hardly stand another such anniversary. Their careful examination of writings by Bacon, which have recently been brought to light in manuscript form or are difficult of access in rare old editions, has failed to add much to his stock of ideas found in the now familiar *Opus Maius* and *Opus Tertium,* and cannot be very encouraging to those trying to raise a fund for the publication of all his works. His

indebtedness to others for many of the ideas on which his fame has rested is indicated, not only by the reaffirmation by the German writers on his Optic of its derivation from the Arab Alhazen (Ibn al Haitam), but by the essay of Professor Baur, who has recently edited the philosophical writings of Robert Grosseteste, upon the latter's influence on Bacon. He asserts that "many laurels" from Roger's "wreath of fame" really belong to Robert, with whose writings Bacon's sometimes coincide verbally. Throughout the volume Bacon's mistakes and superstitions are noted, and, while some writers still regard his trust in experience as marvellous for his times, others make strictures upon his "experimental science". Mr. Pattison Muir admits that Bacon "was not altogether happy in his treatment of what we now call chemical changes. He does not appear to have studied these events much at first-hand. He followed the footsteps of others" (p. 318). Duhem, treating of Bacon's physics, says, "On aime à faire de Roger Bacon un adepte précoce de la méthode expérimentale; des pages comme celles-ci nous montrent assez qu'il expérimentait seulement en imagination." Duhem also illustrates the inane scholastic meanderings in which Bacon's physics could indulge. Dr. Withington gets little of value out of Bacon's medical treatises. Professor Smith, after a survey of "the mathematics of Bacon's time", concludes that he was not justified "in assuming the attitude of superiority which he showed towards most of his contemporaries" (p. 182), that "he contributed nothing to the pure science" (p. 171), and that "mathematics meant to him little more than astronomy" (p. 173). Smith should say "astrology".

Two essays should be mentioned as of different scope from the others. Sir John Edwin Sandys writes on "Roger Bacon in English Literature". Mr. A. G. Little's Introduction gives an excellent moderate statement of the facts of Bacon's life. The only instances where he seems to err are in following the authority of Father Mandonnet at pages 8–9 and 25. Another valuable feature, which his essay shares with several others, is the demonstration that Bacon's writings were not almost forgotten for centuries but exerted a continuous influence.

The chief criticism which may be made of this book is that several essays, unlike those of Baur and Smith, are mere presentations of Bacon's views without sufficient evidence to enable us to estimate his comparative importance. Thus, Dr. Hirsch, while granting that Bacon was no modern comparative philologist, asserts that he was distinctly superior to his contemporaries, but gives us no references to them. Of three German physicists who contribute papers, Dr. Würschmidt merely describes the treatise *De Speculis*; Dr. Vogl's references are exclusively to Brewer's and Bridges's familiar editions of Bacon's works; and Professor Wiedemann's sole note is to Würschmidt's paper. Vogl even appears to have embodied several of Bridges's notes in his paper: compare Vogl, page 214, line 33, with Bridges, II. 428, note 1; Vogl, page 216, lines 22–27, with Bridges, II. 431, note 1; Vogl, page 220, line 25, with Bridges,

II. 46, note; Vogl, page 221, lines 17–25, with Bridges, II. 67, marginal topic, and II. 68, note 1.

I cannot accept the main theses of two essays, namely, Professor Duhem's "Roger Bacon et l'Horreur du Vide", and Colonel Hime's "Roger Bacon and Gunpowder". The physical theory which Duhem credits Bacon with inventing is set forth in chapter LVIII. of the *Quaestiones Naturales* of Adelard of Bath, written over a hundred years before Bacon's treatises. Colonel Hime tries to prove Roger Bacon the inventor of gunpowder by the method which has been employed to prove Francis Bacon the author of Shakespeare's plays—a cipher; but other considerations than the cipher itself invalidate his conclusions. I hope to deal with these two methods elsewhere more fully than present space permits.

A few errors of detail should be noted. In note 1 on page 71 the reference should be to *Moyen Âge,* November, 1894, instead of 1891. One finds the spelling "Pecham" on pages 24, 28, and 235; "Peckham" on 152 and 159. I cannot find the phrase "*homo sapientissimus*" in the passage cited by Hirsch (p. 139); and Hirsch's logic in the two following pages would excite the derision of Bacon's "scholastic contemporaries". Smith (p. 157) incorrectly dates Adelard of Bath about 1180—perhaps a slip for 1130. At pages 262 and 263 we find described two different "troisième expériences"; one of them should be changed to "second" or "fourth". Breaks in quotations are not always indicated by dots (*e. g.,* page 165, line 3, after "attained"); and one is never sure whether the passages set up in close type are true quotations or not. Vogl seems the chief offender in this respect. He runs together passages from 40 to 400 pages apart in Bridges's text and indiscriminately juxtaposes exact translation and loose paraphrase and condensation of Bacon's wording. Moreover, the passage on pages 225–226 for which the foot-note cites Bridges, II. 78, 92, is mainly from Bridges, II. 52–53. Dr. Withington's digression into the history of astrology (pp. 343–345) contains two or three misleading statements.

Lynn Thorndike.

The Place of the Reign of Edward II. in English History. Based upon the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1913, by T. F. Tout, M.A., F.B.A., Bishop Fraser Professor of Medieval and Ecclesiastical History. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XXI.] (Manchester: The University Press. 1914. Pp. xvi, 421.)

One of the greatest needs in English history is a careful study of the administrative system in the later Middle Ages. Anyone who has investigated this period, though never so slightly, is aware of the many unsolved problems which now stand in the way of a thorough understanding of the constitutional development. There is no field in which

more important work waits to be done. Fortunately the publication in recent years of the various calendars of official documents has cleared a part of the way at last for the supplying of this want, and the appearance of such books as Professor Baldwin's *King's Council* and this volume of Professor Tout's are an earnest of what we may expect in future.

Probably the most significant contribution of Professor Tout's book is his study of the organization and functions particularly of the Chamber and the Wardrobe as offices of administration in the reign of Edward II., a period which the author truly says must be considered a turning point in English administrative history. For the twenty years of this reign, more, possibly, than any other period of equal length, mark the advance away from the old system of undifferentiated administration under which the great officials performed all sorts of functions in turn, toward a division of labor and the growth of separate bureaus of administration, each with its staff of trained administrators.

The administrative history of the reign is largely a record of the routine work of a considerable number of minor officials; and the value of this investigation lies in the fact that this routine work is here studied from the unprinted Wardrobe Accounts, and in the further fact that at the outset of the reign the Wardrobe was as much a department of the national administration as the Exchequer and the Chancery themselves. It is in this period that we may perceive the beginnings, in the field of the royal revenue, of the later fundamental distinction between the king and the crown.

The author, however, does not restrict himself to the Wardrobe and the Chamber, but has added valuable chapters on the Exchequer and the Chancery, which are less important only because they are briefer and because they deal with subjects better known. His account of the great constitutional struggle between the Ordainers and the King's Favorites which produced the famous ordinances of 1311, while naturally not bringing out many new facts, is full of original suggestions and new points of view which cannot lightly be rejected. This is particularly true of his estimate of the constructive work of the Despencers in administration and of the financial difficulties inherited by Edward II. from his father.

While the main theme of the book is the history of administration and of the constitutional struggle, the author has added a few sections on the history of the Staple, the art of war, the relations of Church and State, and the foreign and imperial policy of the reign. These sections, he explains, are to be regarded merely as "supplementary to the story of political and administrative reform already told", inserted "rather to indicate new points of view than to emphasize once more a well recognized standpoint".

Not the least valuable feature of the volume is the careful list of administrative officers of the reign given in appendix II. For judicial officers we have the old lists given by Dugdale in the *Chronica* series ap-

pended to his *Origines Juridiciales,* and the later work of Foss in his *Tabulae Curiales.* But these were in great need of revision and they include only the greater judicial officers, while Professor Tout has added also many other officers of administration. Appendix I. consists of the important Household Ordinance of 1318.

Space will not permit a detailed examination of the many interesting suggestions of the book. It is a valuable one; and the author's promised volume on the history of the Wardrobe, the Chamber, and the Small Seals, will be awaited with interest by all students of English constitutional history.

C. H. McIlwain.

The Reformation in Germany. By Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History, Crozer Theological Seminary. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xlix, 466.)

"This is the first attempt, in the English language, at least, to interpret the religious struggle of the sixteenth century in terms of economics." It is the publisher's wrapper that thus challenges our interest. In his Foreword the author himself states that he has spent many years of study on the enormous mass of material now accessible, and that "he has neglected nothing in the more recent literature that promised the least assistance toward a better understanding of the facts or their more accurate determination"; therefore he feels "reasonably confident that he has missed little of substantial value". Important points he buttresses with citations of the contemporary sources, now and then giving extracts in foot-notes. In the appendixes he presents fifty-one pages of documents in translation, thus republishing material previously issued separately under the title of *Historical Leaflets,* including Tetzel's Theses, the Edict of Worms, the Protest at Speyer, the Religious Peace of Augsburg, and "Against the Murdering and Robbing Bands of the Peasants". To guide the reader through the labyrinth of facts he offers a logical clue; and endeavors to create "a readable narrative, worth while for its own sake".

Readable the book undeniably is, in spite of the large page dancing with small type. But for occasional reproductions of tedious theological debates, such as the fifteen pages on the Leipzig Disputation of 1519, and the disquisition on the development of indulgences, the style is fairly vigorous, as might be expected from one who in earlier years was a journalist. He does not drag in the dramatic; he merely glows with a social gospel. Feeling occasionally flashes up into generalization; light is sometimes accompanied by heat. Emphasizing the economic interpretation of history, he dares not focus his enthusiasm on any personality; Luther, who "bestrode Europe like a colossus, dwarfing all men of his time, because of what he was", was "in reality but a chip upon the current of events" (p. 367). Dr. Vedder's real heroes scarcely cross the

stage, though their pathetic shadows flit behind the scenes; they are the Anabaptists, who "sought a true democracy, through a revival of the social gospel proclaimed by Jesus and realized for a time in the primitive church" (p. 293); they "alone had penetrated beneath the surface of traditional Christianity and comprehended the real Gospel of Jesus"; they perceived that "the acceptance of it implied and necessitated a reconstruction of society until all institutions could endure the measurement of the Golden Rule" (p. 345); and when they "were silenced, trampled into the mud, destroyed . . . the clock of civilization was set back three hundred years" (p. 386). Luther, in spite of all his initial inevitableness as the spokesman of the popular demand for reform, became an unreasoning conservative and persecutor, marked now and then by "insane bigotry" and "pig-headed obstinacy" (p. 313); "indeed, if one may trust the evidence of his polemic writings, Luther knew a good deal more about the devil than he did about God; and he certainly manifests more of a Satanic than of a Christian spirit" (p. 309). The reactionary rebel of Wittenberg, who thwarted the almost uniformly hostile bishops by inducing the princes to assume the episcopal power, was acting according to the dictates of class consciousness; "ingrained deference to rank" he elevated to the plane of religious duty, so that "the institutional forms of Lutheranism . . . should be viewed as the inevitable consequence of Luther's peasant birth and breeding" (p. 267). The economic factor was most prominent in the ultimate triumph of the Lutheran movement in large regions of Germany, for it "really owed its success far less to religious fervor than to social ferment and political selfishness" (p. 384); "evidences of greed and ambition fairly shout themselves at the student of all contemporary documents" (p. 387). Yet Professor Vedder does not maintain that the economic interpretation is the key that unbars all the locks. Even to him "the Reformation was a complex movement, inspired by a variety of ideas and aims, social, political and religious" (p. 384).

Such is the construction placed upon the course of German history during the first half of the sixteenth century; upon what is it based? The foundations are usually able to bear the weight placed upon them, but not all the bricks are sound. Is it always safe to quote Luther on the basis of the St. Louis edition, which is an enlarged reprint of the convenient but faulty edition published at Halle by Walch early in the reign of Frederick the Great? In spite of the fidelity of the American editor, one must often look elsewhere for the best texts. Is it safe to neglect official documents like the *Reichstagsakten* and the *Nuntiaturberichte*? In view of the plethora of material noted in the latest edition of the *Quellenkunde* of Dahlmann-Waitz (1912) one cannot censure all omissions, but one often scans the foot-notes with unsatisfied longing. As regards secondary literature, apart from Janssen, whose influence is unmistakable, the Roman Catholic writers on the period have been but little used, Pastor and Grisar apparently not at all. On such omissions

the bibliographies of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* shed much illumination. It is to be assumed that the recent German church histories covering the period have been consulted; but Karl Müller, Möller-Kawerau, and Hermelink have left no direct traces, whereas the exuberant foot-notes of Gieseler, who died sixty years ago, still color certain portions of the narrative. More serious is the small use made of works on economic history, as noted for instance in the second edition of R. Kötzschke's *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte bis zum Siebzehnten Jahrhundert.* In spite of the author's frequent citation of German monographs of the last fifteen years one feels not quite satisfied; and in certain selected portions of the work this impression is deepened by the cumulative effect of minor inaccuracies. Thus within ten pages there occur the following slips: Luther's tract of 1523 is called *Formula missae et commissionis,* instead of *communionis* (p. 268, note 1); the portion of the Augsburg Confession alluded to on page 274, note 1, is article XXVIII., not "XXVII."; the name "John a Plaintz" (p. 277, note 2) should be Hans von der Planitz. Certain statements also provoke dissent. Did not the mad Jan of Leyden, Anabaptist king of Münster, expire under the torture, so that he did not "die of exposure and starvation" in the iron cage that is still on the church tower (p. 348)? Such at least is the testimony of the contemporary Henricus Dorpius: "man . . . bindt sie an drey seulen, und reist sie mit glüenden zangen zu tod, und hing sie darnach jnn dreien eisern körben an S. Lamberts kirchthurm zu einem ewigen gedechtnis" (*Warhafftige Historie,* 1536, fol. [G iiij]). As for the mummied hand shown in the town hall at Münster (p. 349), its female custodian told the present writer a little over a year ago that it had belonged not to Jan of Leyden but to a secretary who had betrayed some secrets regarding the peace of Westphalia, negotiated in part in that very room. It is likewise incorrect to say (p. 310) that the castle at Marburg is "still occasionally the residence of the German Emperors"; the Prussians found it a prison and converted it into archives, which have no state apartments whatever. That Philip of Hesse had a "public repetition" of his bigamous marriage (p. 353) is quite untrue; the ceremony was neither public nor a repetition. These errors are all in minor matters, and do not vitiate the main contentions of the work, whose thesis is stated in the long and excellent introduction; but as most of these points are generally admitted, for instance by T. M. Lindsay in his *History of the Reformation,* the ultimate question is, Has Professor Vedder overstressed the economic factors in the development of the Lutheran movement? The answer must inevitably be that while he has been very fair in the allotment of space, his emphasis has often been one-sided and sometimes polemical. Is this justifiable even from the pedagogical point of view?

William Walker Rockwell.

The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution, and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe. By EDWARD MASLIN HULME, Professor of History, University of Idaho. (New York: The Century Company. 1914. Pp. 589.)

"To George Lincoln Burr, best of teachers and best of friends, this book, so deeply indebted to him, is dedicated." This graceful acknowledgment of obligation stands at the threshold of the work under review. Students who read the book and are happily familiar with Professor Burr's *Outlines of Studies in the History of the Renaissance and the Reformation, with suggestions as to the sources of knowledge,* "printed, not published" by the learned author, will not be entirely in doubt as to the extent of the debt. Others are entitled to know that the book is a "writing-up" of the *Outlines.* It has the chronological limits (1300–1600) of the *Outlines*; its three parts are the same; the chapter titles are substantially and usually identically those of the *Outlines*; the larger divisions of the separate chapters, the marginal rubrics, and the topics treated within the paragraphs of the chapters, with rare exceptions, follow, in order, the analysis of the *Outlines.* How much farther the debt extends, in what degree the treatment of the topics and the interpretation of the larger movements rest upon the ripe instruction of the Cornell master, the reviewer has no means of determining; but a careful reading of the book leads him to the opinion that Mr. Hulme has worked over the entire field for himself and has made it in large measure his own.

It may be affirmed as certain that Professor Burr, generous and modest scholar that he is, interprets the dedication as an adequate acknowledgment of the extraordinary obligations of his former student. On the other hand, the unusual character of the debt imperatively demanded, in the judgment of the reviewer, that the reader of the new book should be given an unusually explicit explanation of its character, and the absence of this explanation must be held to be a regrettable error of judgment on the part of the gentleman whose name appears on the title-page.

The book is presumably designed for advanced college classes, and the absence of bibliographical data may be explained and excused by their abundant presence in Burr's *Outlines.* Its erudition is marked; it is a thesaurus of lore on the leading, minor, and curious personalities in the intellectual, scientific, artistic, literary, and religious life of the period. The style is dignified and felicitous, although at times not untouched with preciosity. It differentiates itself from comparable works in English by its broader conception of the Middle Ages, by its more critical attitude toward Luther and Calvin, and by its more liberal treatment of Roman Catholicism. In a word, its merits are numerous and weighty. It remains for the reviewer merely to indicate some of the respects in which it is defective.

The chapters dealing with political history are largely unilluminated or unilluminating detail, and the same is true of the chapters on the Revolt of the Netherlands and the Religious Wars in France. In view of the larger questions with which the book is primarily concerned, "politics and wars" should "have been relegated to the background" (p. 49) much more completely.

The treatment of the "Renaissance" suggests that Mr. Hulme has not yet thought the matter through. If the "deep, underlying cause of the Renaissance was the revival of the individual" (p. 61), if the "medieval and humanistic ideals are irreconcilable and mutually exclusive" (p. 88), what shall be made of this: "The essential characteristic of the Spanish genius seems to be its extreme individualism. Spain, as a whole, then, was little affected by humanism" (p. 107). Vital and essentially medieval individualism did exist. (*Cf.* D. Schäfer's summary, *Neuzeit,* 1907, I. 13 ff.)

The fundamental flaw in the treatment of the Reformation is the failure to recognize that both the Protestant and the Catholic Reformations were rooted in religious fervor. To say that the "deepest significance of the [Protestant] Revolution lies . . . in the profound awakening of the religious sentiment that it produced" (p. 370), is to treat cause as effect. Luther and Calvin come off rather too badly in comparison with Zwingli. The omission of a chapter on the English Revolt from Rome, which is sketched in Burr's *Outlines,* is inexcusable. The short paragraph devoted to this topic (p. 345) contains a number of extraordinary statements. The chapter on "The Pope, the Comet, and the Devil" is whimsical.

The proof-reading is not well done. "Phillippe" (p. 536), "Gerusalemane" (p. 542), "Vergillian" (p. 543), "checquered" (p. 544), "Alfarach" (p. 547), "Giovanni de Bologna" (p. 551), illustrate this criticism. Siena has dropped out of the index with odd results. The format of the book is very creditable to the publishers.

George C. Sellery.

The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558–1795. By Peter Guilday, Docteur ès Sciences Morales et Historiques (Louvain), Instructor in Church History, Catholic University of America. Volume I. *The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558–1795.* (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. liv, 480.)

From the accession of Queen Elizabeth down to the French Revolution, numbers of Roman Catholic Englishmen lived as exiles in what were originally the Spanish Netherlands. Here they found safety from persecution; here they composed elaborate apologies of the ancient faith; here they organized many a cloister and college, and here some of the more restless spirits plotted in favor of Mary, Queen of Scots, or of this

or that Pretender. Though "the number of English exiles on the Continent never exceeded at any given time the round figure of three thousand" (p. xx), there were among the little groups into which they were divided representatives of some of the oldest families in England, including some men of light and leading, as may be seen from the statistical reports of the English spies.

In Dr. Guilday's chosen field, the history of these colleges and convents, no comprehensive work has been attempted since 1849, though there have been many detailed investigations of special points: the existing printed material which he has listed fills twenty pages. In addition, he has searched for unprinted matter in archives and libraries of England, Spain, and Rome, with good results; from Rome alone he prints twenty-two pages of new documents. In Belgium itself, and in France, however, he discovered disappointingly little, for which he blames the French Revolution (p. viii); yet he did not himself use the Belgian diocesan archives, because their contents are not yet completely classified and catalogued.

In this first volume Dr. Guilday has attempted "a general description of the religious and educational activity of the English Catholic Exiles in the Low Countries" (p. 421). He has been obliged to postpone to a second volume those aspects of his subject which are most interesting to the historian of education and to the student of intellectual development; thus he has not as yet discussed the organization and curricula of the seminaries, and the literary activity of the exiles.

After a preliminary chapter on the English foundation movement in general, the author treats the orders like the Benedictines, the Carthusians, and the Jesuits; he also deals at length with the English College at Douay. Then he considers the various orders for women, and brings to light new evidence in favor of Mary Ward, often spoken of as the founder of the "Jesuitesses", who by a Roman decision of 1909 is entitled to be called the sole and legitimate foundress of the flourishing Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary. To the animosity felt by the English secular clergy for the Society of Jesus, Dr. Guilday attributes the suppression of her work, the confiscation of her property, and her incarceration in the prisons of the Inquisition (p. 176 f.). This is however an exception to the author's rule not to discuss at any length the bitter quarrels by which the exiled groups were often torn. As the documents which describe these feuds from the standpoint of the Seculars or of the English Benedictines are far more plentiful than those which give the Jesuit side, he declines to pronounce judgment, and awaits the publication of the official history of the Jesuits in England, promised in the series which includes the well-known works of Duhr and of Fouqueray. If his attitude toward quarrels among the Catholics is most circumspect, he does not hide his opinion of the Virgin Queen. "Elizabeth was not an ordinary usurper. She was a tyrant of the worst type, without pity, the willing tool of those that hated the Church for gain's sake, and she

was not accorded the same patient courtesy the Christian world meted out to a legitimate occupant of a throne" (p. xxii).

Cardinal Gasquet has carried the story of the English monasteries down to the Dissolution in the time of Henry VIII.; Dr. Guilday has now brought the narrative to the year 1795. It remains for some future historian to continue the investigation down to the present, when so many of the old Netherlandish foundations have moved across the Channel (see the tabular view, p. 40).

The researches have been made with great care and diligence, and they open up many paths for future investigators. Though not meant for the popular reader, the present work is timely: it describes the life of English exiles in Belgium, and appears when England is harboring thousands of Belgian refugees. It is also welcome as an admirable example of a thesis for the doctorate prepared at the now desolated University of Louvain, long recognized as perhaps the foremost Roman Catholic centre in Northern Europe for the study of ecclesiastical history. There are but few other teachers of church history in the United States who are at all acquainted with European archives. Through the impulse given by recent graduates like Dr. Guilday, Louvain may help to raise professional standards in America.

William Walker Rockwell.

The Seymour Family. By A. Audrey Locke. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914. Pp. viii, 386.)

The Cavendish Family. By Francis Bickley. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. vii, 326.)

The Cecil Family. By G. Ravenscroft Dennis. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. vi, 327.)

The La Tremoïlle Family. By Winifred Stephens. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xvi, 341.)

These four volumes form a part of a *Great Families* series aiming to relate the origin and achievements of leading English and Continental families. Certain common characteristics mark those which have thus far appeared. They are not mere pieces of book-making designed to lure the reader who feeds on inconsequential and scandalous gossip, but sober, painstaking narratives based on the sources as well as the secondary literature, general and special. Each, in varying degrees, contains arid stretches, pages of familiar history, military and political, in which the more prominent members of the respective families were involved, plus some inevitable small beer in the case of a few whom nothing but an hereditary name would drag from oblivion. On the other hand, not a little new matter that is vivid and significant finds a place, and the lesser folk are, as a rule, courageously dismissed with scant mention. All four authors are admirably impartial: they "nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice".

Miss Locke gives us a picture of Henry VIII.'s third consort, Jane Seymour, which will be novel to most from its unflattering lights. Strikingly interesting is the story of the "Proud Duke" whose fame rests chiefly on his share in securing the Hanoverian succession, and who, with all his pride, was not above slinking in Harley's back door on occasion. That unsavory person the third Marquess of Hertford, whom Thackeray "damned to everlasting fame" in *Vanity Fair,* and whose last days are described so scathingly by Greville is shown to have been not without his good points, while his "wasted, misguided life", is partly explained by the fact that his declining years were "overshadowed by madness". The long drawn out account of the Lord Protector and his brother the Lord Admiral might have been compressed to advantage, and the rather confusing relations between the two branches of the house of Seymour would have been vastly clarified by a genealogical table. Indeed, all the volumes suffer from this lack, except for brief tables devoted to special branches of the Cecils and La Tremoïlles. Walpole's witticism (quoted p. 274) is one of his best. A few slips might be noted. The account of the famous Floyd's case (p. 132) is so condensed as to be misleading. The name of the famous general, Lord Ligonier, is misspelled "Legonier" (p. 244). It is extremely doubtful whether Bute retained his secret influence so late as the advent of the Rockingham ministry (p. 252). Wilkes returned to England in 1768 not 1769 (p. 257). "Ferdinand, king of Prussia", must surely be wrong (p. 261) and Marck, duke of Albemarle, is an obvious misprint for Monck. No mention is made of the alleged marriage of George V. with the daughter of Admiral Seymour.

Mr. Bickley shows a scholarly caution in discussing the origin of the Cavendishes. What he has told about such picturesque figures as the formidable Bess of Hardwick, the learned Margaret, duchess of Newcastle, the captivating Georgiana, duchess of Devonshire, and that strange recluse and scientific genius Henry Cavendish, makes us wish that he had proportioned his work so as to set forth more such intimate details. However, he has contributed various findings that are welcome: for example, his ample account of the causes for the first Duke of Devonshire's imprisonment on the eve of the Revolution of 1688. Many pungent phrases of the author's and numerous felicitous quotations from contemporary sources might be quoted if space permitted. Duchess Margaret's defense of her literary activities contains observations worth pondering on in any age. The "hereditary probity" of the Cavendishes and their preference for retirement are well brought out, though, apparently, Mr. Bickley has not seen Holland's recent biography of the late Duke of Devonshire, else he would have inserted the duke's admirable story anent the proudest moment of his life. It is no longer believed that "the wars of the Roses made a holocaust of the old families". In view of what is known of the value of money in the sixteenth century one is inclined to doubt that £80,000 was spent on Chatsworth. It is

hardly correct to designate the elder Pitt as "the most capable politician of the day" (p. 217) and certainly misleading to say that tea was shipped to Boston free of duty (p. 227).

In many respects, especially from the standpoint of the historical scholar, G. Ravenscroft Dennis's *House of Cecil* is the most significant volume of the four. The author devotes chief attention to Lord Burghley, to the first Earl, and the third Marquess of Salisbury. While pretending to no originality in the case of Burghley and the late marquess she makes a real contribution in her account of the famous minister of James I., using the Hatfield manuscripts to good purpose. Throughout the book she very properly devotes her chief attention to personal rather than public questions. We are brought very close to the Earl of Salisbury, largely by means of contemporary estimates and letters, and while no attempt is made to conceal his faults we are left with the impression of having been in the presence of a really great man. His effusive letter to Elizabeth (pp. 152–153) is counterbalanced by one that is truly magnificent (pp. 197–198) and Raleigh's to him on the death of the earl's wife is unique in its loftiness of feeling (pp. 166–167). There are two delicious stories concerning "Old Sarum", the wife of the first Marquess of Salisbury (pp. 239–240). The account of the late prime minister is marked by strong conservative sympathies and by a decided animus against Gladstone, but Miss Dennis's final estimate of her hero is just and discriminating. The following are minor points which may be questioned. The use of Roman numerals in accounts was not exceptional up to the last century (p. 27). Antiquated notions as to the value of balance of trade are expressed (p. 61). It is not surprising that the earl's lack of external graces did not stand in his way in securing employment under Elizabeth.

Miss Winifred Stephens takes us across the channel and traces the history of the La Tremoïlle family from the Middle Ages to the French Revolution. While she has read widely in addition, she has made chief use of the family archives published by Duke Charles Louis in the last century. Brutality, greed, and sensuality as well as heroism and loyalty have been characteristic of the various members of the house and all is chronicled with equal frankness. The annals of the fourteenth century are enlivened by extracts from Froissart, and while there is rather too much on the wars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, this is offset by much that is graphic: the romance of Condé, the stirring story of the Lady of Lathom who figures so largely in *Peveril of the Peak*, the amazing career of the Princess des Ursins, and the thrilling adventures of the leaders of the family during the French Revolution; indeed, the treatment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries abounds in interest. While Miss Stephens has an eye for the picturesque and writes at times with dramatic power her style here and there is marred by colloquialisms and threadbare conventional expressions. Moreover, she is inclined to be rather uncritical in the use of the early chroniclers. One

questions, for example, whether Louis, the second count, became so absorbed in hunting that he would pass whole days without food or drink (p. 53). To speak of a *condottierri* (p. 74) is a distressing blunder, and obviously 1559, the date given for the birth of the Lady of Lathom, is a misprint for 1599 (p. 122). It is usually supposed that the Spanish ambassador at Paris and not Louis XIV. made the famous statement, "il n'y a plus de Pyrénées" (p. 231), and it is hardly fair to say that the Archduke Charles of Austria "called himself Charles III." of Spain, since he was proclaimed such by the allies (p. 244).

Externally these volumes are all that could be desired. The coats of arms of the respective families are stamped on the outside covers and each volume is illustrated, the pictures relating to the La Tremoïlles being particularly fine. Altogether, the series promises to be of interest for the general reader and useful, in some degree, to the historian.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

Harrington and his Oceana: a Study of a Seventeenth-Century Utopia and its Influence in America. By H. F. RUSSELL SMITH, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in History at St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: The University Press. 1914. Pp. ix, 223.)

IN this work we have a well-proportioned study of James Harrington's political ideas—their source, setting, and influence. The portions of the book treating of the life of Harrington, his style of argument, the significance of his theories, and the efforts made by himself and his friends to secure the adoption of his proposals by the English government, present nothing substantially beyond what has been contributed by Masson, Toland, Dwight, and others. The value of the work as a new estimation of Harrington's ideas lies in the parts which deal with the contemporary sources of Harrington's views, the contemporary criticism and defense of his proposals, and the subsequent influence of his ideas upon writers and statesmen in England, America, and France.

The main propositions of the *Oceana* are that political supremacy in any community must follow superiority in the ownership of landed property, and that for stability and soundness in government four devices are necessary—namely, the secret ballot, indirect election, rotation in office, and a bicameral legislature wherein the functions of debating and voting are kept separate. The author makes it clear that Harrington could draw these proposals, as well as the other essential features of his Utopia, not only from Roman historians and Greek philosophers, but also from events of his time, from suggestions put forth by men active in the constitutional reconstructions of his day, and from practices in city governments in Italy, the Netherlands, and France, in ecclesiastical and academic elections, and in the administration of merchant guilds. Har-

rington's originality consisted in the co-ordination and adaptation of these ideas into a national system.

In following the notions of Harrington through subsequent writings in England the author seeks first to assign to Harrington primary influence for ideas on the political balance of property, set forth by various writers of the Restoration period. But no definite or close connection is successfully established here, save in the case of Harrington's friend Neville, in whose *Plato Redivivus* Harrington's influence is clear, but also familiar. In the eighteenth century he cites the well-known influence of Harrington's proposals upon the ideas of David Hume, who acknowledged the influence. For the nineteenth century, he shows that George Grote, in his persistent agitation for the adoption of the ballot in parliamentary elections, drew freely from Harrington's writings; and an unpublished essay (in the British Museum) by Grote, on *Oceana,* is described.

For Harrington's influence in America, the author centres his attention, first, upon the seventeenth-century colonial "constitutions" framed for the Carolinas, the New Jerseys, and Pennsylvania; and, secondly, upon the first state constitutions. Though for the former comparisons his examination is specific, in no instance does he make a strong case for any independent influence from Harrington. For the early state constitutions, the net results of his argument leave us only with the fact of John Adams's advocacy, in his recommendations to constitution-makers in several states, of such devices as indirect election, rotation in office, the separation of powers, and with Adams's well-known admiration for Harrington's discussion of these matters.

For France the author draws interesting parallels between the government of "Oceana" and the plan of government prepared by the Abbé Sieyès as a basis for the Constitution of the Year 1800. He also cites contemporary references to show that Harrington was read in France at the time and that Sieyès was believed by some contemporaries to be an imitator of Harrington.

If the above analysis be correct, it would seem that the author has not gone very far in giving new proofs of any definite or original influence of Harrington upon subsequent theory and practice, and that we must still regard the *Oceana* as one of many channels through which ideas from other sources found their way gradually into acceptance in England, America, and France. The book in hand is valuable as a study in comparative political philosophy rather than as a successful study of the influence of political theory upon political practice. It is an interesting study and illuminates the ideas both of Harrington and of those whose views are compared with proposals set forth in the *Oceana.*

F. W. Coker.

A History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe. By David Jayne Hill, LL.D. Volume III. *The Diplomacy of the Age of Absolutism.* (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xxvi, 706.)

The third volume of Dr. Hill's solid study of international development extends from 1648 to 1774. The treaties of Westphalia are very properly the starting point because they opened a new era both in the details of international arrangements and in the general conception of the theory of the State. And it is the influence of the changing theory of the State upon the international relations of states which is the author's main underlying thought. In his own words: "In this period, which may be fitly designated as the Age of Absolutism . . . it is not an exaggeration to say, that for more than a hundred years the destinies of Europe were determined by half a dozen men in each generation; and their motives of action were largely personal."

And yet it is impossible to explain this period in terms of purely individual action. The explanation lies in the application of the prevailing theory of the state. He chooses 1774, rather than the more obvious date, 1789, as the end of the period. For he believes that, from the point of view of the theory of the state, the disgraceful and disastrous reign of Louis XV. which closed in 1774 was the death-blow to Absolutism. The attack on it had already begun by philosophers, pamphleteers, and people. Does Sovereignty reside in a single individual or in the entire body of the nation, was already being asked and answered in 1774. Also, from the point of view of international relations, he believes that in the partitions of Poland and Turkey in 1772 and 1774, "force and conspiracy were unblushingly substituted for the idea of law in the relations of sovereign states. . . . By deriving the idea of law from the will of the sovereign, the Age of Absolutism had planted the seeds of international anarchy; and it had only brought forth its natural and inevitable fruit" (p. 674).

In general character this volume is similar to the two preceding ones which have been noticed in earlier numbers of the Review. Its strength lies in the author's discriminating selection of subject-matter, his broad grasp, his careful and conscientious preparation, his wide practical experience in actual diplomacy at several European courts, and his philosophic habit of thought. In rare paragraphs Dr. Hill occasionally allows himself to make general or philosophic observations; these are so well-considered that one wishes there were more of them. On the other hand, it may seem a weakness in his work that he has little or nothing to say of Grotius, Pufendorf, Bynkershoek, Vattel, Moser, and the other writers who were helping to form the rules of international law; likewise, little or nothing of Wicquefort's *L'Ambassadeur et ses Fonctions,* or of the ceremonial and usages of diplomacy; in fact there are many things which one might expect to find in a "History of Diplomacy"

which will be sought in vain here. Such omissions, however, were in accordance with the author's plan, and doubtless conduced to unity of thought and treatment. A more serious weakness, from the historian's point of view, lies in the fact that in narrating diplomatic relations Dr. Hill has not depended primarily on the diplomatic correspondence itself, even where it was easily available in print; he has relied rather on the monographic studies which deal with successive phases of European diplomatic history and has thus sought to make a synthesis of the researches of others. Such a method may serve very well in treating of Brandenburg in the seventeenth century, where he is able to follow two such recent and admirable monographs as those of Waddington and Pagès. But it is less satisfactory, for instance, in discussing the First Partition of Poland, where he is guided by Sorel's *La Question d'Orient au XVIII^e^ Siècle* and consequently treats it mainly from the French, Prussian, and Turkish sides; invaluable for the Russian side are the diplomatic papers published in the *Sbornik* (easily accessible, because largely written in French though edited in Russian), and the accounts of the preliminaries to the partition in Bilbassoff, *Geschichte Katharina II.*, and Tchetchulin, *The External Politics of Russia in the Beginning of the Reign of Catherine II.* (in Russian).

However, Dr. Hill's third volume is an excellent outline, probably the best in English, of the diplomatic history of Europe during the century and a half before the French Revolution. In so good a book Admiral Tromp should not be allowed to go on sweeping the Channel with a broom nailed to the mast-head (p. 10). It is scarcely true that Carlos II. made his will bequeathing the whole Spanish Succession to the Duke of Anjou because "it was persistently sought by every means within the power of Harcourt", "who pursued this course with the knowledge and approval of Louis XIV." (p. 277). Louis XIV.'s minister, Harcourt, had left Madrid long before the will was made; and Blécourt, who had been left in charge at Madrid, had been instructed by Louis XIV., August 30, 1700, in regard to a possible will: "Vous ne devez faire aucune démarche pour l'obtenir". In fact, Louis was probably intending to adhere to the partition treaty, and Blécourt was so little in touch with what was going on at the bedside of the miserable moribund Carlos, that on October 28, only five days before the will was signed in favor of the Duke of Anjou, he had written to Louis XIV. that the will would be in favor of the Austrian archduke. It was not French diplomacy, but outraged Spanish pride and the hope of preserving unpartitioned the vast Spanish inheritance, which caused the will in favor of Louis XIV.'s grandson. The terms of the treaty of Utrecht (p. 333) and of the Swedish-Prussian treaty of 1720 (p. 394), as given, are not quite correct. The Great Elector was to receive a French subsidy of a hundred thousand livres and not a paltry "ten thousand livres per annum" (p. 160). The King of Poland is more intelligible as Wisniowiecki than "Wiesnowski" (p. 108); Basnage than "Bosnage" (pp. 122, 167); and Borkowski than "Borowsky" (p. 535).

There are very helpful bibliographies at the close of each chapter, and convenient chronological and genealogical tables and maps at the close of the volume.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Mémoires du Roi Stanislas-Auguste Poniatowski. Tome I. (St. Petersburg: Académie Impériale des Sciences. 1914. Pp. xv, 720.)

FEW men who have played a large rôle in history have had such a mania for writing as did the last King of Poland. Throughout his life he was accustomed to jot down his experiences and his impressions; to keep memoranda of the transactions in which he had participated, the conversations he had had, the speeches he had made; to preserve his tremendously voluminous correspondence. With the aid of this mass of documents, he set out in 1771 to compile his memoirs. The task was frequently interrupted and resumed only after long intervals, so that the bulk of the work was done in the very last years of the king's life. After his death there were found among his papers ten volumes of memoirs covering virtually his whole career except—unfortunately—the period from 1778 to March, 1794. These volumes were sealed up by order of the Emperor Paul and have since reposed in the Russian archives. Their publication, long eagerly awaited by students of Polish history, has now been undertaken, with the support of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, by the Director of the Central Archives of the Empire and of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, M. Sergius Goriainov.

The present volume contains four of the ten "parts" or "volumes", into which the king divided his memoirs. The first deals with his youth and early travels to Vienna, Paris, and London; the second with his famous sojourn in St. Petersburg and his courtship of her who, as he himself says, "was henceforth to be the arbiter of his destiny"; the third relates the events which led up to his accession to the throne; and the fourth describes the gathering storms of that unhappy reign down to the king's abduction by the Confederates of Bar, on the eve of the First Partition.

It must be confessed that these memoirs offer few surprises or revelations. In large part this is due to the fact that during his lifetime the king communicated extensive extracts from his writings to Prince Adam Czartoryski and others, with the result that in 1862 the firm of W. Gerhard in Leipzig was able to publish the well-known *Mémoires secrets et inédits de Stanislas Auguste,* which although only in the form of fragments, with the text often badly garbled and most uncritically edited—contained most of the striking episodes and important passages from the second and third parts of the work now before us. The same year Żupański in Posen brought forth in the original French and in Polish translation a collection of excerpts somewhat fuller and textually more

correct than the Gerhard edition; and in 1870 J. I. Kraszewski published the first and second parts of the *Memoirs* entire (*Bibliotheka pamiętników i podroży po dawnej Polsce,* t. III.). If one adds to all this the fact that many Polish scholars have had access to the papers of Stanislas Augustus preserved in the Czartoryski Museum at Cracow, it is clear that the bulk of the material contained in the present volume was already, in one form or another, known to the world—or at least to that part of the world which reads Polish.

At any rate, we have here for the first time the king's own account of his life in full and authentic form. Owing to the methodical manner of their compilation—with the documentary evidence always close at hand—the *Memoirs* are, in general, accurate and reliable beyond most works of their kind. Occasionally, however, one comes upon a false date or an erroneous statement. For example, the king was certainly wrong in supposing (pp. 505–506) that his election was immediately due to Panin's courage in ordering Kayserlingk to disobey the empress and formally propose Count Poniatowski as Russia's candidate for the throne. The credit belongs to Repnin's bold initiative. And we now know that in the famous affair of the arrest of the Four Members at the Diet of 1767 Repnin was acting in strict accordance with orders from St. Petersburg, although the king asserts quite the contrary (p. 601). What chiefly detracts from the value of the *Memoirs,* however, is their manifestly apologetic character, their tendency to gloss over Stanislas's blunders, their reticences—for instance, with regard to his unavowable transactions with the Russian ambassadors—their exasperating silence on so many subjects. What lends them their chief interest is the light they throw upon the character of a king who was, perhaps, the most intelligent, cultivated, and charming man of his nation, but who was also fatally weak of will, corrupt at heart, and utterly devoid of moral courage and stamina.

R. H. Lord.

Le Maréchal Mortier Duc de Trévise. Par son Petit-neveu le Colonel Frignet Despréaux, de l'Ancien Corps d'État-Major. In two volumes. (Paris and Nancy: Berger-Levrault. 1913–1914. Pp. viii, 453; 477.)

None of Napoleon's marshals is less known than Mortier; no serious biography of him has hitherto been attempted. These two large volumes are apparently a small installment of a work which will by its bulk and documentation, if not in other ways, go far to remedy this state of affairs. They have been put together by a relative of the marshal who has had access to the well-stocked family archives, and who has further made appropriate researches among other documents. The book is in fact little more than a series of excerpts from documents, the author's comment being on the whole unimportant.

Mortier left no memoirs, but on the other hand he kept a journal, a dry and brief record of military orders and movements of troops, in fact the dry bones of his professional career. It may be said at once that to judge from the presumably copious extracts from this journal here printed, it is not of great importance for the period included in these volumes, though its evidential value is high, being a record kept by Mortier for his own use and entered at the dates of the events. The journal is supported by documents printed from letter-books containing copies of Mortier's correspondence; these begin to present some valuable features after his appointment to command the Army of Hanover in 1803—that is, the second part of the second volume. There are also some matters of value for Masséna's operations in Switzerland in 1799.

In addition to these family papers Colonel Despréaux has been to the Archives Nationales and to the Ministère de la Guerre, for such documents as bear on the marshal's campaigns. It may be doubted, however, whether his method of selection of these documents has been altogether a good one. He might well have printed those that related directly to Mortier, or again those that related to the campaigns that Mortier fought in and that were hitherto unprinted. He has done neither the one nor the other, but has given us a great mass of matter, nearly all of which is of very slight interest save in relation to the details of the administration of the French army. Very little of it is personal to Mortier, most of it is trivial, and not all of it is unpublished. It refers to the campaigns in the Netherlands, Germany, and Switzerland from 1793 to 1800, in which Mortier participated, and cannot be said to add appreciably to our knowledge of them. It appears probable, however, that with the next volume, which will carry the narrative to the Ulm and Austerlitz campaigns, more valuable material will be reached.

Mortier was reputed the tallest of the marshals, and the most honest; these volumes, including as they do many details of Mortier's administration of Hanover in 1803–1804, confirm the impression of his high integrity. Although he did not come into personal relation with Bonaparte until the Consulate, he was soon an established favorite and was appointed military governor of Paris. Napoleon was nearly a foot shorter than his subordinate and one day this amusing scene occurred. The emperor wanted a book from his shelves which he could not reach. The marshal pulled it down for him, and remarked: "Je suis plus grand que vous, Sire." "Vous voulez dire de plus haute taille", retorted the emperor.

Colonel Despréaux gives us no explanation of Mortier's rapid rise in the years 1798–1799. In the former year he was given the 23d Cavalry, having fought his way up steadily since volunteering in 1791. He became a brigadier-general in 1799, was promoted general of division on the battle-field of Zurich by Masséna in the same year, and lieutenant-general, commanding the Army of Hanover, by Bonaparte in 1803. It is the defect of Colonel Despréaux's documents, or of his method, that

too little light is thrown on essential facts, and too much on trivialities. His standard of accuracy is high, however, and he raises considerable hopes that the ensuing volumes may shed valuable light on the campaigns of the empire.

R. M. Johnston.

Le Chartisme, 1830–1848. Par Édouard Dolléans. In two volumes. (Paris: H. Floury. 1912–1913. Pp. 426; 501.)

This is an important book marred by one inexcusable fault; it has neither foot-notes nor bibliography. Particularly inexcusable is this failing in a book which deals in the minute factual knowledge of a field hitherto largely unexplored, and one which the student of social and economic history justly regards as exceedingly fertile and promising. And the real pity of the thing but becomes the more prominent as the genuine merits of the books are disclosed.

Mr. Dolléans has succeeded admirably in analyzing the economic misery in which Chartism found its rootage; the sudden shifting in employment brought about by machinery, the death-struggle of the domestic industries, the introduction of child and female labor, the violent fluctuation in wages and employment—these corollaries of the Industrial Revolution are more clearly and succinctly stated than in any book yet published. Mr. Dolléans has also, with all the epigrammatic wit and clarity of expression which characterize so many of the modern French historians, played his search-light on the rock-bottom explanation of the Chartist movement and of the Chartist failure. He relates, in full detail, the address of one Richard Pilling, a strike leader, before a jury, in which Pilling tells in simplest terms the bitter fight of one man against poverty, the old story of impossible hours, diminishing income, uncertain employment—and the vain attempt of a local strike against the manufacturer. This man, says Dolléans, "représente, mieux qu' aucun autre, l'ouvrier chartiste, parce qu' il reste dans sa simplicité malgré ses opinions politiques plus ouvrier que chartiste". The efforts of the Chartists to get men of this condition in life interested in the Chartist movement are narrated with fullness. The story is vividly told of the competition met with here between Owenite, trade-unionist, and free-trader; and against the latter Mr. Dolléans launches justly his greatest scorn, the encounter between O'Connor and Cobden at Northampton, which he describes, being particularly significant and enlightening to us of the present.

But within the Chartist ranks there are very serious dissensions: the three leaders, Lovett, Bronterre O'Brien, and O'Connor are at loggerheads, divided not only upon tactics, but upon fundamental principles. The sympathies of Mr. Dolléans are decidedly with O'Connor and the physical force Chartists. He satirically refers to Lovett as "consecrating himself to popular education and school books for children", and

holds that his willingness to compromise with the middle classes, as evinced by his attitude toward the free-traders and the non-conformist interests, was detrimental to the Chartist cause. Bronterre O'Brien also is attacked. He is scornfully called "a schoolmaster" and "a man of theory", although certainly it must be conceded that O'Brien's idea of land nationalization was more practical than O'Connor's land-bank scheme. Between O'Brien and O'Connor there was much bad blood and Mr. Dolléans, on the face of the evidence, seems over-anxious to champion the latter. O'Brien's objections to a permanent convention were assuredly not without reason, and his refusal to take part in the last great Chartist demonstration is at least made in manly fashion. This book does not do him justice.

There are a few minor errors of fact in *Le Chartisme,* such as the statement (I. 167) that Richard Oastler had made and lost a large fortune. More serious is the omission of certain discussions that one expects to find in such an elaborate piece of scholarship, as for instance: the relations of the Chartists with Alexander Carlyle and the other very considerable group of British free-thinkers the radicalism of whose ideas certainly extended to political and economic matters; the relations of the Chartists to the British republicans, of whose publication and propaganda there is no mention in this book. One would also like to know more of Ernest Jones, the Chartist poet, and the substitution of some of his stirring verse for the long harangues of O'Connor would have been profitable. But more serious than this is the suspicion that Mr. Dolléans has trusted far too confidingly to the columns of the *North Star,* O'Connor's organ. The *North Star* is the one great source constantly mentioned in the body of the narrative—and the *North Star* was a very biassed sheet. But without foot-notes how can we be very sure just what Mr. Dolléans's sources have been?

Yet, in the last analysis, this book is exceedingly valuable. It brings to light many interesting if not hitherto unknown facts among which may be put: the intimate relation of the Chartist movement to the international radicalism of 1848, and also the abortive but none the less significant attempt to include woman suffrage as an integral part of the Chartist propaganda. Furthermore, Mr. Dolléans has beautifully and clearly demonstrated that Chartism was essentially an economic not a political agitation.

WALTER P. HALL.

Historisch-Politische Aufsätze und Reden. Von HERMANN ONCKEN. In two volumes. (Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg. 1914. Pp. vi, 344; ii, 382.)

FEW recent volumes by German historians possess the interest for students of contemporary history that these two volumes of essays and speeches have. The greater part of the first volume is directly related

to the literature of the more conservative Pan-Germanists; the bulk of the second deals with the preliminaries of the formation of the empire from 1848 to 1871. The first volume contains an eloquent eulogy of the Kaiser (1913); the Ideas of 1813 and of the present (1913); the United States and the Great Powers; "das Deutschamerikanertum"; Germany and Austria since 1871; a biography of the historian, economist, and agitator, Schäffle; Germany and England: the increase of the army or of the fleet (before the Heidelberg branch of the Navy League, 1912); an essay on Nationality; one on "Politics, History, and Public Opinion"; and two long essays on Sebastian Frank, the historian of the sixteenth century. The second volume contains six essays on various aspects of Bismarck's life, and sketches of Grand Duke Peter of Oldenburg, Count Alexander Keyserling, Bennigsen, Ludwig Bamberger, von Roggenbach, Freytag, Camphausen, Mevissen, Reichensperger, Marx, and Engels.

These biographical essays, several of which were originally book reviews, some of which were memorial addresses, others of which were papers read before societies more or less learned, can hardly be said to add greatly to our store of information, but they abound in pithy restatements of views, in the evidences of clear vision, and contain lengthy appreciations of such important books as Von Sybel's *Begründung des Deutschen Reiches* and evaluations of certain collections of material which the student will find useful.

But the essays and speeches in the first volume are those upon which Oncken himself has wished to lay particular emphasis, and which are to-day, because of subsequent events, of the greater interest. They are, of course, propaganda rather than history, opinion rather than research, but they give an excellent notion of the political propaganda at the great universities in the last ten years, and show the extent to which the teaching of history has been a part of the political and national movement. The essays seek, says Oncken in his preface, "to throw the light of historical knowledge upon subjects which hitherto were left in the river of partisan quarrels", "to arouse political parties to a stronger consciousness of their historical place in the national life", and "to place the political debates of the nation upon a foundation of historical knowledge". The historian who eventually attempts to trace the development of the militarist spirit in Germany, its relation to public opinion, and the methods of the government to proselytize through the schools and universities, will find much interesting material in these speeches and essays, for they leave little doubt that Oncken has played something better than a subordinate part. The fact alone that he was selected to give these patriotic addresses is significant and invests his statements with something more than the weight of his own learning.

The two most unusual and important chapters are those upon American foreign policy, the growth of the Monroe Doctrine, of Imperialism, and upon the German migration to America and "Deutschamerikaner-

tum". These occupy nearly a third of the first volume. He sees in the Monroe Doctrine, Imperialism; in the Pan-American Congress of 1826 anything but a "peace-conference". "What seems to be a strong renunciation of European politics means, however, no renunciation of policies of Imperialistic conquest. . . . The difference lay simply in the fact that this expansion henceforth had nothing to fear from Europe, but could extend itself in all directions without European opposition at the expense of non-European powers." "Peace on Earth and *Our Interests*—this conjunction of visions of world's peace and schemes of world conquest we recognize already in Jefferson's first policies as the key (*Leitmotiv*) of a specious American foreign policy, and we find it again in the theories of the founder of the Monroe Doctrine." American policy differed from that of European powers not so much in purpose as in opportunity. He compares Mahan and Roosevelt to Droysen and Treitschke, Seeley and Froude. Mahan's books, he thinks, had "an effect upon public opinion comparable to that of the German Navy League". In Roosevelt he sees a man "moved by the great propelling force of American Expansion", inspired by "a national Idealism" and by the consciousness of the need of a national ethical impulse. He, too, is full of the "specious cant" of American foreign policy, and this enabled him, "one of the strongest nationalists of the present day", to receive the Nobel Prize.

In conclusion, he says, "In the first rank of conquering world powers is the Union now to be found. But the further it progresses along this road, the more it will be drawn into the net of world antagonisms, the more it will be compelled to take sides with the great coalitions, and the more it will lose the early peculiarity of continental isolation with all its advantages in an age in which the Great Powers and their dependencies stretch around the globe."

He traces with some sorrow the progress of the amalgamation of the Germans into the American people, and looks forward to the growth of "a powerful public opinion, when the Germans, side by side with the Irish, react strongly against the natural English-American alliance, when they insist that America is an English-speaking country, but not of English but of mixed culture, not of English but of mixed blood". He lauds the foundation of a strong society in America to place German side by side with English in the instruction of the public schools, and to foster German-American history as part of a new national life. Germans in Germany "must become conscious that over there, in Deutschamerikanertum, lies a part of the organism of the German people, which belongs to our national being". Of the actual reality of this Germany in America, he admits no doubt. Such utterances shed a flood of light upon German ideas about America and American conditions.

ROLAND G. USHER.

The Balkans: a Laboratory of History. By WILLIAM M. SLOANE, Professor of History, Columbia University. (New York: Eaton and Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham. 1914. Pp., viii, 322.)

IT cannot be said that this book is happy in either its title or its subtitle, for, to the expectant spirit of the present reviewer at least, the title seemed to promise something like a history of the Balkans, while the subtitle suggested that the offering would be in the nature of a series of seminar studies educing from Balkan examples some general principles of historical development. That nothing was farther from the author's mind than a book along such lines is frankly avowed in the preface, where we read that the present volume is composed of essays contributed some years ago to the *Political Science Quarterly* and recently rewritten in the light of the great Balkan conflict of 1912 and 1913. The author also informs us—and the vivacity of his text fully confirms the announcement—that he has been a frequent visitor of the steaming witch's-caldron of the southeast corner of Europe and that his pages record actual impressions received while adventurously sampling its changing sights and savors. If these circumstances of composition could have been suggested in the title the reader would have been spared a certain disillusionment; he would not have judged a collection of essays by the literary standards of a book and he would not have been constantly irritated by the absence of internal coherence and of unity of design. The author himself, impressed with the difficulty of making his traveller's views and discussions carry professional authority, was at pains to bind them together with a little historical cement. But the result is not encouraging. The first chapter, covering the long period from the coming of the Turks to the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid, moves at such lightning speed that the whole mass of events runs into an indistinguishable blur. And when on later occasions some present-day issue is illuminated by opening a limited vista into the past the statement of fact frequently leaves much to be desired. There is no evidence that Stephan Dushan died while assaulting Constantinople (p. 68); Bulgarian beginnings go back far beyond the twelfth century (p. 126); it is a mistake to tell the story of the fall of Alexander of Battenberg in such a way as to leave the impression that the patriotic party got rid of him (p. 129); the *zupanate* was certainly not "a type of monarchy established by a certain Stephan" (p. 134); and neither the Servian church nor the Servian peasants are recognizable in the misstatements (pp. 134–135) intended to describe them. Everything considered, the historical background vouchsafed us by the author is slight and unreliable.

After this perhaps undue emphasis on what the book is not, it is right and proper to insist that as a discussion of the many contemporary problems vexing the Balkan world the volume has high merit and is

touched at all times with that liveliness which is bred of first-hand knowledge. In these problems too one could wish for more order and a better co-ordination, but at least the crucial topics are all broached and the evidence marshalled with information, breadth of view, and sympathetic understanding. In regard to the ethnology of the Balkans the author shares the opinion that the traditional theories as to the origin of the peoples of the southeast are all in the melting-pot; the doctrine of pure races, above all, invites his amused derision (ch. III.). The moral sham of the much bandied catch-words nationality and pan-Slavism is exposed, and Balkan federation, past and future, treated with that touch of cynicism which continued occupation with Balkan affairs imposes on the gentlest spirits. The atrocity charges of the recent war are examined with judicial calm (ch. VIII.), the future development of Bulgarians, Serbs, Rumanians, and Greeks subjected to a kindly analysis, and with the tentative air of a rather weary scholarship the book offers as the upshot of so many pages of travail the mild conclusion: "In particular the dogma that nationality, ecclesiasticism, and consanguinity are the foundations of political efficiency has been discredited."

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Cyclopedia of American Government. Edited by Andrew C. McLaughlin, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., Professor of History, University of Chicago, and Albert Bushnell Hart, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., Professor of the Science of Government, Harvard University. In three volumes. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1914. Pp. xxxiv, 732; vi, 773; v, 785.)

This work was planned and projected about four years ago. It now appears as the matured product of nearly 250 contributors who have co-operated under the editorial guidance of two well-known students of history, government, and law, Professor McLaughlin of the University of Chicago and Professor Hart of Harvard. No one can scan its comprehensive plan without conviction that the work was designed to meet a wide range of needs among those who desire to know something about the present and past workings of government. While the plan is not an imitation of any known to the reviewer, the work itself bears a likeness to such well-tested books of reference as Lalor's *Cyclopaedia of Political Science, Political Economy, and of the Political History of the United States* (3 vols., 1881–1884), Conrad's *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften* (third ed., 8 vols., 1909–1911), Maurice Block's *Dictionnaire Général de la Politique* (2 vols., 1873–1874), Cerboni's *Enciclopedia di Amministrazione di Industrie e Commercio* (5 vols., 1891–1904), and even to Palgrave's *Dictionary of Political Economy* (3 vols., and Appendix, 1901–1908). These are all works specially useful to students

of modern government. They differ in the emphasis placed upon its manifold factors.

The term Government in this latest of reference works has been interpreted in a sense broad enough to comprehend much of what Lalor and his collaborators meant by political science, political economy, political history, and biography. But the editors, while extending the field of biography so as to include a larger number of names (*circa* 220), have reduced political history to a narrower range, and have limited political science and economics to such theoretical and practical phases as bear relations more or less direct to the actualities of present-day American ideals, practices, and institutions. Greater attention has been given to topics in constitutional and international law and diplomacy; to topics in local (state, county, and municipal) government; and to a multiplicity of topics in the wide field of public effort for and regulation of the popular welfare. Extra-legal practices and party devices have been considered at such length as to make it clear that the editors have not forgotten the maxim familiar to readers of John Stuart Mill: in politics, as in mechanics, the power which is to keep the engine going must be sought for *outside* the machinery.

In the three volumes there are some 2890 topics separately treated by, approximately, 245 contributors. Of these contributors quite two-thirds are teachers by profession; the remaining third, of about eighty names, is made up of writers, experts, and men of affairs, many of whom have had actual experience in positions of administrative responsibility both in and outside government circles. The experience and qualifications to write on special topics of such men as Rear-Admiral Chadwick, E. Dana Durand, Gaillard Hunt, Francis E. Leupp, S. N. D. North, James Brown Scott, Thorvald Solberg, Lawrence Veiller, and Charles D. Walcott are too well known to need comment. But it is not on the shoulders of such men that the burdens of contribution have rested. Of the total number of topics, more than 2320 were prepared by only fifty contributors. Among these contributors Professor O. C. Hormell of Bowdoin College stands first in number of topics (*c.* 288), most of them very brief explanations of political terms or definitions of political slang phrases. Professor Hart is next with about 212 topics, twenty-seven of these notably long, and all of them revealing extraordinary variety of interest—a veritable gamut from such subjects as Abolitionists, Art Schools, Conservation, Influence in Government, to Vice Commissions, Vice-President, and an explanation of the sobriquet "Watch-Dog of the Treasury". Add to these two names the following five: Professors Davis R. Dewey (*c.* 184 topics), William MacDonald (*c.* 180), McLaughlin (*c.* 106), Judge Emlin McClain (*c.* 101), and Professor G. G. Wilson (*c.* 93)—and we have the seven most hard-worked members of the staff. As giving a still clearer view of the better quality of effort that has been utilized to so large an extent in the work, one might name —somewhat at random but with reference to numbers of topics in a de-

scending scale—Professors Jesse Macy (*c.* 64), W. B. Munro (*c.* 49), J. W. Garner (*c.* 44), J. A. Fairlie (*c.* 43), W. W. Willoughby (*c.* 36), J. M. Callahan (*c.* 32), P. J. Treat (*c.* 32), E. H. Vickers (*c.* 30), J. R. Commons (*c.* 26), C. A. Beard (*c.* 22), J. S. Reeves (*c.* 15), W. F. Willoughby (*c.* 15), C. H. Van Tyne (*c.* 14), and F. J. Stimson (*c.* 13). Not one of the fifty contributors just referred to has prepared fewer than twelve topics. Contrasted to these first fifty are the eighty names that stand for one contribution apiece. It should be clear, then, that about 115 contributors have had the comparatively light task of providing the remainder, or approximately 500 topics. The professor of colonial history at Oxford, Hugh E. Egerton, is the sole foreign contributor. Six women have expounded eight topics.

Turning from contributors to form, scope, and content: the longer and more important topics to the number of 350 are given prominence by titles running, at the outset of the articles, across the double-columned pages—"treatise" articles they are termed by the editors. These treatise articles, not confined to matter-of-fact statements, are designed as more or less discursive essays on a variety of themes. In the course of such articles authors have occasionally forgotten that a cyclopedia is an adjunct to, not a principal of, learning, and that debatable or controversial matter should have no place. Among articles of this type, varying much in merit, but notably long, are three by the senior editor, two of these consecutive articles on Boundaries of the United States, Exterior and Interior (I. 150–166, including maps), the third on Presidential Elections (III. 8–46, with tables); an article on the Democratic Party (I. 565–576) by Professor MacDonald; an article on Political Science by Professor J. W. Jenks, followed by a group on Political Theories (II. 713–732) by Dr. James Sullivan, Professors W. W. Willoughby and H. A. Yeomans; Population of the United States (II. 739–757, including maps and tables) by Dr. North; the Republican Party (III. 189–201) by Professor Woodburn; and an article on Suffrage (III. 443–457, with elaborate tables) by Professor G. H. Haynes. About thirty of the forty-eight articles on the history and governments of the separate states of the Union take this treatise form. I have noted others in the same class, carefully considered, well written, and sure to prove helpful to students of historic problems: two excellent articles by Professor Roscoe Pound of Harvard on Codification (I. 302–305) and Jurisprudence (II. 264–268); Commercial Policy and Relations of the United States (I. 339–344) by Professor Clive Day of Yale; an informing treatment of the Committee System in the United States (I. 355–360) by Mr. Charles Moore of Detroit; Political Parties in Congress, 1789–1913 (I. 388–392) by Professor T. C. Smith of Williams; two in particular by Professor McLaughlin on Courts and Unconstitutional Legislation (I. 508–510) and Place and Significance of Party (II. 640–644); a thoroughly fresh and informing exposition by Professor Allen Johnson of Yale of the Democratic-Republican Party, 1792–1828 (I. 576–581); three articles by

Professor F. J. Turner of Harvard (his only contributions) setting forth in brief compass his well-known views on the Frontier in American Development (II. 61–64), on Sectionalism (III. 280–285), and on the West as a Factor in American Politics (III. 668–675); a group of articles by Professor Macy of Grinnell on sundry phases of Party Government (II. 620 ff.); and finally an article—one of several on the same general theme scattered through the volumes and all done by the same writer, Professor Treat of Stanford University—on Public Lands and Land Policy (III. 93–97).

It is of course impossible in limited space to do more than suggest the variety of topics, minor and major, that mark still further the character of the work. The very numbers of topics grouped under such subjects as Banks and Banking (18), Constitution, Constitutional, Constitutions (20), County (12), Courts (24), Education (16), Schools (31), Indian (8), Labor (14), Law (12), Legislation and Legislatures (12), Parties and Party (16), State and States (21), Tax (13), Taxation (12), Taxes, (6)—these may reveal the direction of certain well-analyzed themes more or less intensively set forth. Nothing corresponds to that remarkable series of articles on American history prepared by the late Alexander Johnston for Lalor's *Cyclopaedia*, a series which occupied about a fifth of that work. But American history—interpreted from the pragmatic standpoint and chiefly since the colonial period—has been dwelt upon with respect to such features as Colonization, the Revolution, the framing and establishment of the Constitution, the democratic forces of the Jackson epoch and of later times, Slavery, the Negro Problem, the Civil War, the Confederacy, Reconstruction, and Expansion. Judge McClain and a few other contributors have analyzed briefly a good many leading cases in law from the days of the Parson's Cause (1763) to the Northern Securities case of 1904 or later. Of the biographical sketches, about a fifth (*i. e.*, 45) are of living men. More than 160 of such sketches—all varying slightly in length—have been prepared by Professor MacDonald. Some hundreds of political terms, slang phrases, and stray words have been briefly defined or explained. "Jingoes", "Roorback", "Quids", "Stalwarts", and the like, may be worth while. But when it comes to "Bar'l", "Back from Elba" (1910), "Dago", "Junket", "Kid-Glove Politics", "Radio-Telegraphy", "Sorehead", "Stampede", "Still-Hunt", "Tidal-Wave", and others, I venture to think that the space might have been used to better purposes, for the numbers of such expressions or terms are countless; many of them call for no explanation; their presence here satisfies chiefly the demand for what the Germans style *Unterhaltungslektüre*.

The essential features of government in the Dominion of Canada have been fittingly entrusted to such men as Professors G. M. Wrong, Stephen Leacock, W. B. Munro, and Mr. Edward Porritt. In view of half a dozen capable students in the United States of Latin-American history and conditions, it is surprising to find one writer alone responsible for

some twenty topics on the outline aspects of government in Latin-American countries, although Professors J. H. Latané, H. E. Bolton, and Chester L. Jones have contributed the articles on our diplomatic relations with these countries. Professor Goodnow has handled the general theme, Administration in Europe. Various experts have been utilized to treat our diplomatic relations with Asia and Africa as well as with many of the leading states in Europe, with China, Japan, the Near East, Liberia, the Barbary States, the Pacific Islands, etc. Australia in its federated aspect, the Union of South Africa, the Hanseatic League, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Influence of Rome on Modern Government are topics touched upon with comparative brevity. Greater attention is paid to Parliament, the House of Commons, and local government in Great Britain.

There is an air of authenticity about printed matter, especially when such matter is found between the covers of a dictionary or cyclopedia as promising-looking as this, that amounts almost to sanctity. The casual reader, the inexperienced student, the school-teacher, and often the hurried man-of-affairs, give credit to such material with seldom a moment's hesitation or doubt. Credit is strengthened by the mere sight of a bibliographical note appended to a topic. The names of many contributors to these volumes carry assurance of much conscientious effort and care. Occasional typographical errors must occur even with the utmost precaution on the part of scrupulous editors, painstaking printers and publishers. No amount of inept chatter from reviewers is likely seriously to affect the value of such a work provided due attention has been given to the manifold particulars of which wisdom consists. Has this sort of attention been given?

As it stands, much of the work reveals what Mr. H. G. Wells has recently termed "the vice of second-rate energetic". Neither editor seems to have had time to look with adequate care to details. Errors in typography glare at one, beginning with names, initials, and titles in the list of contributors and extending to the close of the third volume. Narrative, titles of books, especially dates- all suffer at various points. There are rather more than 2200 pages of text. In these pages there are certainly twice that number of errors. Accents on foreign names or on the words of titles in foreign languages are sometimes correct, but are just as likely to be wrong. The well-informed reader may overlook such errors as "Prudhon" for Proudhon (I. 41), "E. V." for G. von Zenker (I. 41), "G. T." for J. P. Gordy (I. 48), G. "Sselle" for Scelle, author of *La Traite Négrière*, not *Negriére* (I. 84), "Story" for Storey (I. 93), "Eugene" for Émile Dupuy (I. 122), "1 *Vesey* J . . . 1" for 1 *Vesey*, Sr. . . . 194 (I. 166), "De Toucqueville" (I. 403), "Ordinanzes" for Ordenanzas (II. 22), "H. V". for A. von Schwartz (II. 39), C. "Illbert" (II. 615), Thomas More "(1608–1674)" for (1478–1535), II. 724, or even "H. A. Hilary" for Hilary A. Herbert (III. 82) and "John Ward . . . of Agawams" for Nathaniel Ward of Aggawam

(III. 253). But in most of the following instances of error, I have had to resort to the aid of several obliging experts in bibliographical lore in order to resolve the mysteries: "W. H. Ewin" for Major W. H. Emory, "W. Fitzwilliam Martin" for William Fitzwilliam, Viscount Milton, M. P. (I. 159), L. N. "Wheaton" for Whealton, "'Massachusetts and New York Boundary Line' . . . in xix (1906)" for Massachusetts and New Hampshire Boundary-Line Controversy in vol. xliii (1909), 77–88 (I. 166), "U. S. Dept. of State, *Passport*" for a government publication entitled *The American Passport: its History* (1898), by Gaillard Hunt (I. 273), and "R. G. Boone" for C. F. Thwing (I. 634). The name of former Secretary of Agriculture Norman J. Colman is insistently allowed to stand as "Coleman". Henry "Stanberry", "Edward" for Edwards Pierrepont, Amos T. "Ackerman", and Wayne "McVeagh" (I. 95) mar a list, in several other respects not above criticism, of attorneys-general of the United States. In this connection attention should be called to one error likely to do injustice, if it is not noted, to one of the careful contributors to the work: the good article on the Federalist Party (I. 721–725), attributed to "H. M. B." (initials of two contributors), was written by Professor Allen Johnson of Yale.

The following comments are intended to suggest a few useful as well as a good many questionable features: (i) *Chart* of the Internal Organization of the Department of Agriculture (I. 16–17): one of ten similar aids, all undated and without evidence of authenticity. The positions of assistant-secretary and assistant-chief of the Weather Bureau misleading; several other details questionable. The Chart of the Department of Commerce (I. 335) reveals a non-existent Division of Publications in the Bureau of the Census. Previous to 1909 such a division was under the chief-clerk (not the director) of the Census Bureau, but has since then been consolidated with the Division of Revision and Results. Chart of the Interior Department (II. 200–201): the four divisions set down under the Topographic Branch belong properly to the Geologic Branch of the Geological Survey. Chart of Department of Justice (II. 272) substantially correct, but gives erroneous idea of the very variable assignments to subordinates. Chart of Post-Office Department (II. 762), quite the best in the work. (ii) *Cabinet Members* (I. 195–198): an excellent list, in most essentials reliable. The name of T. M. T. McKennan, secretary of the Interior from August 15 to 26, 1850, has been omitted. The statement (p. 195) that elsewhere in the work "all *ad interim* appointments even for a day or two" will be found is misleading. Without the use of manuscript sources, no more accurate lists than those in Mosher's *Executive Register* (1903) have been compiled, and Mosher's lists have not been carefully followed (see lists: Secretaries of Agriculture (correct), I. 20; of Interior, II. 199; of Navy, II. 506; of State, III. 402; of Treasury, III. 565–566; of War, III. 648–649; of Attorneys-General, I. 95; of Postmasters-General, II. 766–767). The articles on the various Departments will be found useful, but those written by Mr. G. Hunt and Mr. A. P.

Andrew respectively on the State Department (III. 378–381) and the Treasury Department (III. 560–564) quickly show how advantageous to writers is familiarity with actual working conditions. (iii) *Exterior Boundaries* (I. 150–159): well conceived, carelessly written and put together. Not a word about a crucial provision of the Jay treaty for the adjustment of the St. Croix boundary or about the important treaty of 1908 concerning the Canadian international boundary (*Treaties and Conventions,* ed. Malloy, I. 815–827). Misinterpretation of ground of our claim to the possession of Long Island and neighboring waters (p. 151). There are no "San Juan Islands lying in Puget Sound" (p. 153). Uninformed statements about "Mars Hill" (p. 155). Confusing and misleading paragraph on the Alaska Land Boundary (p. 157). A single good map and several careful diagrams to which references could be made in the narrative should replace the six mediocre maps to which no reference is made. Bibliography of twenty-six references ill arranged, the single really useful work on the topic (J. B. Moore's *International Arbitrations,* I.) being found near its close. (iv) *Turkish Capitulations* (I. 228–229): hardly adequate, for the three periods of this subject, marked by three dates (1535, 1740, 1856) are not clearly set forth. The leading recent work (G. Pélissié du Rausas, *Le Régime des Capitulations dans l'Empire Ottoman,* second ed., 1910) is not mentioned in the list of references. (v) *Drago Doctrine* (I. 610–612): excellent in every way except for typographical errors in bibliography. Inasmuch as the Calvo Doctrine appears in connection with all concessions acquired by United States capitalists investing in Latin-American countries, a topic might well have been devoted to it. (vi) *Educational Statistics* (I. 647–650): accurate tables accompanying a useful article. (vii) *Public Aid to Expositions* (I. 700–701): thoroughly misleading, for the figures on which its value depends are chiefly remarkable for their variation from even an approximation to the facts. I base my judgment on a comparison with the figures drawn from official sources for the use of members of Congress on exactly this topic and compiled under date of December 29, 1910, by the Division of Bibliography of the Library of Congress, the summary never, probably, having been printed. (viii) *Illiteracy* (II. 142): based on the statistics of the Twelfth Census of 1900, some of which were misread. Entirely unreliable. (ix) *Impeachment* (II. 149–151): a painstaking analysis and clear exposition likely to prove useful. (x) *Robert R. Livingston* (II. 361): three palpable misstatements in one short paragraph. (xi) *Population of the United States* (II. 739–757): an excellent article. The eight leading maps would be more significant had they been accredited to their probable source, the *Statistical Atlas* for 1900, and the "Report on Population" for 1910. The variation in shading, carefully reproduced on the map on page 752, which throws it strangely out of accord with the others in the series, was originally due to an error by a draughtsman in the Census Bureau and might easily have been remedied, had inquiry been made there by the editors.

(xii) *Public Records* (III. 107–108): an unsatisfactory treatment. A record, in government parlance, is something recorded or copied in contradistinction to something filed. Files are the communications to the department, the records communications *from* it, although the latter term is loosely applied to both sorts of matter. Why should not a work on government explain such interpretations? British archive-management in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is unduly praised in comparison with Continental. (xiii) *Table of Salaries* (III. 247–249): the absence of date and authorities for this leaves one free to guess that it was compiled largely from the *Official Register of the United States* for 1911. With respect to a good many items it is now out of date; but even in 1911 the Comptroller of the Currency was not paid a salary of $12,000. (xiv) *Political Satirists* (III. 253): carelessly written and uninformed. The reference to "Cooper" as a "personal journalist" in the group with William Cobbett and James T. Callender, probably refers to Thomas Cooper (1759–1840), scientist, friend of Dr. Joseph Priestley, and president for many years of the College of South Carolina. John Trumbull, author of *McFingal* (1774; 1782), certainly should have been referred to. But why were not the *Biglow Papers* and their author named? Instead, after listing such names as Artemas Ward, Petroleum V. Nasby, and Orpheus C. Kerr, the writer says: "They were followed by E. L. Godkin, the editor of the *Nation,* an unterrified dissector of his opponents. . . . Since 1890 the field has been taken by Wallace Irwin . . . and by 'Mr. Dooley'". (xv) *Secretary to the President* (III. 280): a useful topic, had it been well treated. There have been upwards of forty such secretaries, whose names (with dates of their services) should have been accurately given. As it stands, there is almost nothing to it which is not the veriest commonplace.

The index (III. 707–785) is adequate. Because of heavy calendered paper, the volumes are needlessly heavy. The type used in the text is 8-point, the same that was used in Lalor's *Cyclopaedia.* But the matter in this new work is less, by about 750 pages, than is to be found in Lalor. It may be recalled that Lalor provided no index.

Henry Barrett Learned.

Guide to the Materials for American History, to 1783, in the Public Record Office of Great Britain. Volume II. *Departmental and Miscellaneous Papers.* By Charles M. Andrews, Farnam Professor of American History, Yale University. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1914. Pp. viii, 427.)

The appearance of this volume marks the completion of a notable series of guides to the sources in British repositories bearing on American colonial and Revolutionary history. The first volume was devoted to the papers in the British Museum, Bodleian Library, and other places outside the great central archive building. Two volumes embrace the

papers in the Public Record Office, one covering mainly the Colonial Office papers and the other now before us the departmental and miscellaneous papers.

The same high qualities which attach to the first volumes are equally characteristic of the last. Sound scholarship, expert knowledge, and the expenditure of much time and patient energy are very evident in the work. Every practical aid seems to have been devised to facilitate the approach to the vast, unworked mines of raw materials, affording the searcher opportunity to husband his time and strength. The content, character, and value of the sources are described in general in some cases, in others the contents are listed in detail. At every appropriate place there is inserted a brief account of the features and practices peculiar to a particular office, thus throwing light on the nature of the archives. The introductions, covering the history of the various executive agencies, their structure, procedure, functions, archives, and their relations one to the other and to colonial business, constitute a background of the greatest service to one who uses the records and in themselves are important contributions to the literature of English government and imperial administration.

At least one-half the guide is allotted to the records of the two great executive boards of the Admiralty and Treasury. The papers of the War Office, Commissariat, and Paymaster-General, and of the High Court of Admiralty each cover about forty pages; the Customs Board and Declared Accounts each about twenty. The few remaining pages are sufficient for the records of the Lord Chamberlain, Modern Board of Trade, and a few special collections of private papers. In point of time the sources bear largely on the eighteenth century, particularly the period 1740–1783. British colonial control did not assume full and definite shape till after 1700 and the period of the last French wars and the revolt of the colonies naturally called into fullest play the activities of the great executive departments. In point of content the records bring into view the great imperial problems of defense, finance in all its varied aspects, trade, administration both in England and in the colonies. It is a rich and abundant aggregate of raw material, hardly touched, and concerned with a period and side of American colonial history barely treated. When this mass of material has been worked through, analyzed, and presented by scholarly investigators, then we shall know something of the nature, the scope, and the spirit of British imperial policies and of the relations of the colonies to the parent country.

The work of Dr. Jameson and the group of able and scholarly associates in elaborating guides to the material in foreign archives for our history is a sure sign that we are coming to a study of the past with a new vision. Too frequently our history has been written as if American life, problems, and growth were somehow unaffected by and unconnected with the main currents of the world's history. A reaction has set in and undoubtedly the work of exploring and charting foreign archives

is one of the important forces weakening the older attitude of isolation. The Spanish War brought us new duties abroad and we became conscious of our relations with the other great political communities. Great interest was promptly recruited in the subjects of colonies, seapower, world commerce, and politics. In the year of that war Professors Andrews and Osgood in timely and noteworthy papers deprecated the customary narrowness displayed by writers of our colonial era and dwelt upon the need of taking an angle of observation broad enough to comprehend the colonies in their imperial connection. To this cause Professor Andrews has done a service of inestimable value. His great work as guide-maker alone entitles him to the highest praise. By his writing, teaching, and kindly counsel to others he has done much to give impulse, direction, and shape to the movement designed to bring to light and to correlate and balance the three great factors in our early history, the colonies, the mother-country, and the relations between them.

W. T. Root.

A History of Connecticut: its People and Institutions. By George L. Clark. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1914. Pp. xx, 609.)

Histories, especially state histories, have been presented recently in so condensed a form that we welcome as a step in the right direction the generous dimensions of this volume, in which the author has felt willing and able to allow himself the space of 609 octavo pages for the treatment of his subject.

It is true that when the volume is examined much is found that is usually furnished by a gazetteer, or a magazine of local history, but there is nothing that is not covered by the title and the evident purpose of the book—to present the history, not only of the state of Connecticut, but also of its people and its institutions. Since J. R. Green set the fashion, we have become accustomed to having histories contain much more than were formerly considered strictly historical facts, and the author of the present volume has been gratifyingly liberal in his interpretation of the functions of an historian.

The strictly historical work of the volume is well done. Mr. Clark has handled his authorities independently, has followed good writers upon special subjects as well as being familiar with the previous historians, and has been fortunate in his critics, whose help he acknowledges most fully. It is perhaps unfortunate that his work preceded in its appearance Dr. De Loss Love's most careful and scholarly *History of Hartford,* which has laid at rest forever the ancient fallacy of the creation of the commonwealth by the union of existing towns, and has pointed out most clearly the relation of the settlement of Connecticut to the "Lords and Gentlemen" who were grantees under the Warwick Patent.

Mr. Clark treads warily however, and admits that the basis of the Provisional Government "was the assumed consent of the grantees under the alleged Warwick Patent, represented by John Winthrop Jr., rather than on any inherent authority of the Massachusetts Bay Colony".

In his treatment of colonial history, Mr. Clark is most conservative. The Charter Oak and its history are given as undisputed facts. "Priest" Peters receives his customary berating for his witty *jeu d'esprit* known as the *History of Connecticut*. The history of the Andros "usurpation" adopts Trumbull's invectives unquestioned. The author is fair and moderate in what he has to say about the treatment of the Quakers and the witches. It is true that Quakers were not ill used in the colony of Connecticut proper, though they suffered great hardships in New Haven and at Southold, but they were everywhere denied the common rights and privileges of Englishmen. The witchcraft delusion was, as the author says most truly, no worse in New England than in the mother-country, and Connecticut was disgraced with no such bloodthirsty panic as occurred in the Bay Colony. There was enough of it, however, to disgust modern citizens of Connecticut with the superstitious intolerance of their ancestors, and all that can be said in extenuation is, that they were not as bad as others.

The author is impartial in his theological comments. He holds up the Saybrook Platform and the Half-Way Covenant to abhorrence, and he tells the story of the expulsion of the Yale undergraduates who attended a New Light meeting in their vacation. He is strictly fair in his account of the dethronement of the "Standing Order" in the peaceful revolution of 1818.

The limits of a review will not allow a discussion of what is indeed a characteristic part of the work, the history of manners and of industry. It is, perhaps, sufficient to say that the work contains a great deal of curious and interesting information, and it may be recommended to those who desire to come into sympathetic familiarity with the manners and customs, past and present, of the denizens of Connecticut from the "huge reptiles and the terrible mastodon" down to the monster enterprises of the New Connecticut.

A History of the National Capital, from its Foundation through the Period of the Adoption of the Organic Act. By WILHELMUS BOGART BRYAN. Volume I. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xv, 669.)

THE City of Washington is the National Capital; that is the most comprehensive description that can be given of it; but to call it the National Capital is to call it by its descriptive title instead of its name. This book ought to have been called a History of the City of Washington. It comes up to the year 1814 and is to be followed by at least one other volume. The chief sources of material are, besides those works

which are generally accessible, several manuscript collections in Washington—the Papers of the Continental Congress in the Library of Congress, the District of Columbia Papers in the State Department, the papers in the office of the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds in the War Department, the Thornton, Henley-Smith, Washington, Jefferson, and Stoddert papers in the Library of Congress, the early city records, and a number of obscure local imprints which contain valuable information concerning the city. The publications of the Columbia Historical Society, which Mr. Bryan has used freely, have brought to light a great deal of valuable data which would have been hidden if that society had not been formed.

Mr. Bryan's research has been conscientious and his style is unpretentious. He obtrudes no so-called historical discoveries and he holds no brief for a particular character. The result is that we feel confidence in his work. The book discloses greater research and industry, however, than skill in historical treatment, and some matters of supreme importance in the history of the city are treated as if they were of subordinate interest. For example, the bargain between Jefferson and Hamilton was the immediate cause of the location of the Capital on the Potomac; but Mr. Bryan gives a meagre account of it. He has missed an important fact in relation to the change of votes by which the bargain was carried out, for he states that two members changed their votes—Alexander White and Richard Bland Lee of Virginia—whereas there were two others—Daniel Carroll and George Gale of Maryland. Carroll afterwards served as commissioner of the District and Mr. Bryan's account of him loses some force by the omission of the important part he played in locating the District.

The book opens with a discussion of the genesis of the idea that there must be a national capital; then follow the offers of various sites to the Continental Congress and the selection of the Potomac River region. There is a good description of the region, the early Indian inhabitants and the early white settlers. In chapter V. Mr. Bryan tells of the first church established in the District—that at Rock Creek in 1712—of the earliest school in 1785, of the first newspaper in 1789, of the early importance of Georgetown and the belief that it was destined to become one of the great ports of the country. Washington's itinerary in his investigation of the region in which Congress said the District must lie is told with interesting detail.

His selection met with general approval. He succeeded in including a Maryland and a Virginia city in the new district and he provided, as he thought, for a great commercial centre. The intricate proceedings which attended the establishment of the city are unravelled with detail and thoroughness. Mr. Bryan goes over the story of L'Enfant and Ellicott with impartiality and justice. L'Enfant's splendid plans were accepted; but L'Enfant was so constituted that he could not work in harmony with the commissioners and to lay out the city presented

practical questions of immediate importance which he would not attend to, so his separation from the enterprise became a necessity. Mr. Bryan says: "It is quite apparent, however, that he was determined on his own way, and mingled with the persistency of an egoist, was the serious lack of system and steadiness in continued effort. He was probably incapable by nature of following with constancy a given course and was beset and led astray by the largeness and variety of his conceptions as well as his firm conviction of the superiority of his ideas." There is an account of the various sales of lots and the discouraging efforts of the commissioners to raise money with which to build the city without an appropriation from the general government. In 1792 Samuel Blodgett, jr., appeared on the scene, the first of a long line of "promoters", who caused the early history of the development of the city to be inextricably interwoven with the efforts at personal aggrandizement of speculators. Blodgett was appointed "Supervisor of the buildings" and in general of the affairs of the District in 1794, and used his official position with a view to improving his personal fortune; but he did not succeed; in fact the early speculators nearly all failed, and the city was the grave of their hopes of fortune.

The government moved to the new city in 1800 and then began the problem of its government. Robert Brent was appointed mayor in 1802 and held the office until it was made elective in 1812. Mr. Bryan traces the rise of the local institutions chiefly in the last three chapters.

This is the best of the histories of Washington; in fact, it is the only one which deserves to be classed as a permanent contribution to the history of the city.

GAILLARD HUNT.

MINOR NOTICES

Master-Clues in World-History. By Andrew Reid Cowan. (London and New York, Longmans, 1914, pp. vii, 331.) This is an essay in "historical dynamics", which attempts to discover the "master clues", in the sense of the fundamental factors, which shaped the evolution of society. It is anthropology, geography, anthropo-geography, sociology, rather than "world history" in the ordinary sense of the political history of the various countries of the world. It deals (except for the last two chapters) with prehistoric man and the influence of his environment upon him. After distinguishing man from the animals by his capacity to use tools, he proceeds to the effects of climate, to the beginnings of agriculture, and of pastoral life. "Predatoriness" he finds a master clue. Nomadism is another, and its passing marked the beginnings of real civilization. The influence of the sea was progressive; the subjection of women a hindrance to the development of the race; slavery was the product of a sedentary civilization. History as recorded he thinks shows "drift" rather than purpose. The "tillage civilizations"

(the historic nations) have spent much time in aggression but differ from the less developed because they have always promptly repaired the waste.

The author is not a professional historian, but had already attained mature years before deciding to devote his leisure to study. His book is the result of wide reading by an acute mind. He was unfortunate, however, in selecting a subject which life-long study has not enabled even brilliant specialists to treat without exposing themselves to just and sometimes severe criticism. Much of his material is significant but not new; many of his profuse illustrations are curious and interesting but not very apposite. He is not sufficiently familiar with evidential problems or skilled in historical narration to subordinate the unessential and so to place in relief his master clues as to give the reader a coherent and unified impression of what he believes the course of development of society to have been.

R. G. Usher.

The Irshád Al-Aríb ilá Ma'rifat Al-Adíb or Dictionary of Learned Men of Yáqút. Edited by D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt., Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, and printed for the Trustees of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial". In six volumes. (Leyden, E. J. Brill, London, Luzac and Company, 1907–1913, pp. xvi, 431; xiii, 438; xv, 219; xii, 520; xii, 531.) It is now nearly fifty years since the first volume of Wustenfeld's six-volume edition of Yáqút's great Geographical Dictionary appeared. Scholars will be glad that at last, through the liberality of the Gibb Trustees, Professor Margoliouth has been able to carry out the work which he tells us he designed undertaking many years ago and has made accessible in a printed edition part of the same author's *Dictionary of Learned Men.* Unfortunately he could give an edition of only a part of this great work, for, as he informs us, diligent inquiry has failed to reveal the existence of a manuscript of the whole work. In fact manuscripts of any part of it are very rare, so that volumes I., II., and III. 1 of this edition are based on a single manuscript in the Bodleian Library (MS. Bodl. Or. 753). At the time the preface of volume III. 1 was published this was the only known manuscript of the first of the four volumes into which the work seems to have been originally divided, so that for correcting the text the editor was obliged to have recourse to manuscripts and printed editions of authors whom Yáqút had copied or who had copied Yáqút. The preface to volume V. informs us that since the preface to volume III. 1 was published, "a manuscript containing some of the matter already published, but far older than the Bodleian manuscript, has through the kindness of Professor Yahuda come into the possession of the Bodleian Library". It is to be presumed that at least some of the results of a comparison of this manuscript with MS. Bodl. Or. 753 will be published in the concluding volume of this edition.

Volumes V. and VI. (nos. III. 2 and IV. being reserved on the chance of recovering more of the work), which seem to cover volume III. of the original work, are based on two manuscripts, one in Constantinople, the other formerly in Bombay, but now the property of Professor Margoliouth and Mr. Amedroz. It is on the latter manuscript that the larger part of volume VI. is based.

The editor informs us that the Gibb Trustees have agreed to publish an index to the five parts of the work already issued. This index will be preceded by a biography and by a collection of emendations proposed by various scholars. A final estimate of this edition may well be reserved till the appearance of this volume, but meantime both Professor Margoliouth and the Gibb Trustees are to be congratulated on the publication of the handsome volumes of this important work.

An Introduction to the History of the Church of England from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By Henry Offley Wakeman, M.A. Eighth edition, revised with an additional chapter by S. L. Ollard, M.A. (London, Rivington, 1914, pp. 22, 519). The author of this deservedly popular and successful outline died in 1899 while preparing the sixth edition which was completed from his notes and duly published, three years after the first edition appeared.

In this eighth edition by Canon Ollard, the work has been corrected in several places, and revised by the addition of foot-notes, bringing it into harmony with the latest investigations. A concluding chapter has been added by the editor, covering the past seventeen years. An index and a chronological table are given, but no maps are inserted. The book is written in a graceful, interesting style, and gives a scholarly presentation of English Church history from the high Anglican standpoint, but with sympathetic appreciation of the Evangelical, if not of the Broad Church movement.

The author fails, as most of the writers on the subject fail, to understand the true place and development of the papacy in the English Church. A paragraph on page 220 illustrates this—"There never was in any true sense a papal church in England, but for nine hundred years there had been planted in England the Catholic Church of Christ, over which during the last four hundred years the popes had gradually acquired certain administrative rights which were now (1534) abolished." This is historically incorrect and misleading. The Catholic Church planted in England and flourishing there for nine hundred years was the papal church. The pope was acknowledged as fully and freely in England from the time of Augustine as he was anywhere else, indeed with less opposition; and the administrative rights acquired in England, in the four hundred years after the conquest, were the same acquired during that time throughout the whole Catholic Church in the West. The *English* Church was started by Augustine and traced its continuity through the unbroken succession of archbishops of Canterbury from Augustine on,

every one of whom received the pallium from the pope. A sentence at the foot of page 29 indicates a more correct view—"In Kent and Wessex, the Church was Roman and Papal, and had at its back the traditions of Western Christendom, the culture and prestige of Rome, the authority —vague and undefined, but constantly growing—of the See of Peter." The conversion of other parts of England from other sources does not affect this fact, for this was the beginning of the English Church, while the Council of Whitby and the archbishopric of Theodore established its continuous unity with the See of Rome as an integral part of the whole papal church of the West.

The supplementary chapter gives a valuable compendium of recent events and phases of church life in England, but of course the time is not yet when a true historical perspective can be given. In regard to one phase it is interesting to note that the recent attempt to introduce the Benedictine order, both for men and for women, proved unsuccessful and the larger part of the two communities seceded to Rome in 1913. Other large communities, however, have been established.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

Siegelkunde. Von Wilhelm Ewald. *Wappenkunde.* Von Felix Hauptmann. [Handbuch der Mittelalterlichen und Neueren Geschichte, herausgegeben von G. von Below und F. Meinecke, Professoren an der Universität Freiburg i. B.] (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, 1914, pp. xiv, 244, 40 plates, viii, 61, 4 plates.) Of the two manuals which here appear in this excellent series, that of Ewald offers a convenient summary of the subject of sigillography. Fuller than the valuable outline of the subject by Ilgen in Meister's *Grundriss,* it is broader in scope than the recent French manual of Roman, which the author has evidently not seen. Although Ewald's own studies have been specially devoted to the seals of the Rhineland, he has worked his way through the extensive literature of sphragistics, including the local investigations which have been especially numerous in France, and treats the subject comparatively for the whole of Europe. After the fashion of the German manuals, he is fuller on the methods of preparing and applying seals and on their relations to chancery practices than on their external appearance and their interest for the history of costume and portraiture. One of the best features of the manual is the admirable series of forty plates which bring together a body of illustrations, many of them from fresh originals, such as has hitherto been available only in scattered and for the most part costly works. Here and there some of the author's statements need correction, as when he says (p. 157) that in the earlier period no regular distinction was made in the employment of different colors of wax. This is not true of the Sicilian kingdom of the twelfth century, where the royal seals were red, while those of the king's officers were green (*English Historical Review,* XXVI. 446).

Hauptmann's treatise is much briefer, giving only an outline of the

subject and referring for all developments to the fuller manual which he has in preparation. The material is for the most part limited to Germany, and the references are almost exclusively to German manuals, so that the student of the heraldry of other countries will gain little by mastering the technical German vocabulary. Even within the narrow limits set him, however, the author has indicated new conclusions which he hopes to justify in the larger volume. It is to be hoped that he will there consider critically the evidence which has been brought forward for the use of coats of arms in England and Normandy somewhat before the year 1150 from which he dates their introduction.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A Short History of Feudalism in Scotland, with a Criticism of the Law of Casualties and a Chapter on the Ancient and Later Constitutions of Independent Scotland. By Hugh B. King, Solicitor. (Edinburgh and Glasgow, William Hodge and Company, 1914, pp. xxvii, 242.) This is an ill-ordered and tedious attack upon a recent decision of the House of Lords affecting the "casualty of composition" incident to the tenure of certain lands in Scotland. In the course of his treatment the author professes to explain the historical basis of this incident or casualty. He finds it in "the overgrown, illegitimate Scots feudalism" introduced from without and fostered by "visionary feudalists, great and small, ancient and modern, and their copyists", obscurantists biassed "in favour of the despotic foreign systems which they exclusively studied". These "feudal usurpations", once established, were enacted into pretended statutes by the "rampant marauders", who composed the "mere illegitimate coalition of feudal chiefs" which went by the name of the Scots Parliament in the seventeenth century. Thus this "feudal customary unlaw" was first introduced in the "illegitimate period of Scots feudal law" after the death of Robert Bruce, in imitation of the "despotic foreign system" which the "alien Norman Conquest" had brought into England; and it then gradually replaced the "beneficent legitimate Scots feudal system" which had existed in "the early legitimate period" under the "ancient Scot-Saxon constitution". Such assertions occur throughout the book with wearisome iteration but with little attempt at proof or even at explanation. The author's evident ignorance of Continental feudalism may probably be explained by his statement that "to deem such despotic foreign law to be legitimate Scots feudal law would tend to reduce a free people, with their worthy earlier traditions and beneficent laws and customs to the level of the conquered and decadent races of the Continent in barbarous times". Such ignorance, however, does not increase our confidence in the historical soundness of a book which professes to be, even though it is not, a "History of Feudalism in Scotland".

C. H. MCILWAIN.

Henry VII. By Gladys Temperley, Fellow of Newnham College, Cambridge. With an Introduction by James T. Shotwell. [Kings and Queens of England, edited by Robert S. Rait and William Page.] (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xiv, 453.) To the reader who has only a slight knowledge of the reign of Henry VII. this biography offers the most pleasant avenue of approach. It is more readable than Busch's and it has the advantage over Gairdner's of giving references to authorities and of being more comprehensive. The author appears to have made an independent study of the sources and her statement of fact seems to be in the main trustworthy. The book is not entirely free from misprints (*e. g.*, pp. 9, 83, 262) or from small errors of detail. "Italy", for example, could scarcely have been the ally of Henry VII. (p. 141) and Rymer certainly cannot be cited as authority for the assertion that Henry "on 14th July 1488 accepted his ambassador's action in renewing the treaty with France until January 1491–2" (pp. 76, 77). Such slips are not of sufficient frequency, however, to mar seriously an interesting narrative.

To the student who is already familiar with the works of Busch and Gairdner this book is likely to be a disappointment. The author who follows such writers may reasonably be expected to advance our knowledge a considerable distance. This Mrs. Temperley fails to do. She has brought to light little from sources not explored by these earlier biographers and her acquaintance with foreign literature seems to be much more limited than theirs. The work of Schanz, for example, is not mentioned in the rather carelessly constructed bibliography and it does not appear in the foot-notes except as quoted by Busch, although two chapters are devoted largely to economic and social aspects of the reign. In her chapters entitled Settlement in the Kingdom, 1485–1487, and Last Years, 1503–1509, there are a number of new facts, the appendixes contain a useful itinerary of the king, and the work as a whole renders Henry's personality a bit more definite. The reviewer has discovered no further contributions, except of comparatively unimportant details. Since large bodies of contemporary manuscripts still guard their store of information, the definitive biography of Henry remains unwritten.

W. E. Lunt.

The Age of Erasmus. Lectures delivered in the Universities of Oxford and London. By P. S. Allen, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914, pp. 303.) The reader must not suppose this book to contain a systematic series of lectures on the age of Erasmus. "Aspects of the Age of Erasmus" would have been a more exact title. With the exception of the paper on Erasmus and the Bohemian Brethren, read at the last International Congress of Historical Studies, a paper which comes nearer than the rest to full treatment of its subject, the lectures are such talks, well written but a little casual, as a man steeped in learning respecting Erasmus and his period might write

out, on occasion, for a cultivated audience. Schools (mostly Johann Butzbach's experiences), Monasteries (mostly Nicholas Ellenbog), Universities (mostly Erasmus), and Pilgrimages (mostly Felix Fabri), are four of the themes most entertainingly treated, while on private life and manners, on public force and fraud, and on the differences that make the Renaissance point of view and that of Erasmus so unlike our own, many interesting things are said, urbanely and without pedantry, but also without pretension to completeness. In a word, we have here, not a treatise, but a delightful book.

Registres du Conseil de Genève. Publiés par la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève. Tome V., *Du 7 février 1492 au 4 février 1499 (volumes 13 et 14).* (Geneva, Kündig, 1914, pp. vii, 621.) The life of one of the four syndics who formed the core of the Genevan *consilium ordinarium* was not an altogether happy one. It is not surprising to find one syndic-elect offering to pay any fine rather than serve. A member of the council attended regularly two and often three sessions weekly besides several meetings annually of the general assembly of all citizens. In 1493 there were 124 meetings of the ordinary council and five of the general assembly. About six items on an average were treated at each meeting; the burden however lay in the following up of these items, the insistence upon prosecution of offenses, visitation of houses, streets, bridges, markets, investigation of complaints, devising means of raising money, maintenance of schools, resistance to encroachments upon the city's liberties, and keeping the balance between prince-bishop and his *vicedominus* and episcopal council, dukes of Savoy, and the commune itself. The complication was the greater because of the kinship and youth of dukes of Savoy and bishops of Geneva, a pair of five-year old cousins in 1495–1496. Naturally the city found little protection from its five-year old prince-bishop against his own father when the latter became duke.

By great firmness and shrewdness, timely gifts to influential courtiers, and appeal to Geneva's *iura* and written *franchises* solemnly sworn to by bishop and *vicedominus*, the sturdy representatives of the citizens usually proved successful. They appear to have secured the return of the bishop's court to Geneva, preserved a coveted market, and prohibited river obstructions (*fichiae*, in one case at least fish weirs). The records however leave the council still struggling against the bishop's demand for the tongues of all animals slaughtered. It required both independence and tact to protest successfully to those very ecclesiastics whose advice and aid they frequently had to seek in resisting the duke's illegal arrests and demands for subsidies.

There are the usual instances of police and sumptuary regulations: prohibitions of wandering about the streets after nine o'clock; disarming of foreigners and requirement of swords in citizens' houses; measures to protect against fire, the pest, loose women, mendicants, wandering

pigs and geese; regulation of prices of wine and meat (mutton and pork being priced about twice as high as beef); and an unrepeated and probably fruitless attempt to "attend to the dress of women". Of particular interest are the prohibition in 1494 of sales, work, or games (*in publico*) on Sundays or feast days and, especially, the opening of *apothecae* on Sundays; examples in 1493–1494 of care to maintain neutrality between France and Germany; and several entries which disprove the statement of the celebrated eighteenth-century historian Gautier, who had no access to this volume and who held that there was no mention in this period of the council of fifty.

The admirable 114-page index suggests many topics for investigation, and gives useful French equivalents for obscure Latin terms. Scholars will be indebted to the skilled and accurate editors MM. Gautier, Van Berchem, and Rivoire, the Genevan Historical Society, and individuals who have given the series financial support. The subsidy of the Genevan *Conseil d' État* is amply justified and should be continued. The editors deserve every encouragement in their purpose to go on with the publication of the sixteenth-century records.

HERBERT DARLING FOSTER.

Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505–1905, and of the Earlier Foundation, God's House, 1448–1505. In two volumes. Compiled by John Peile, Litt.D., F.B.A., Master of the College. (Cambridge, University Press, 1910, pp. viii, 620; vi, 954.) Hardly anything but affection toward an ancient college could persuade so accomplished a scholar as the late Dr. Peile to carry out the enormous labors of detail involved in such a work as this. Taking for his model Dr. Venn's *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College,* he undertook to give in compact form the discoverable facts respecting the biography of every member of his venerable society from the foundation of God's House in 1448 to the year 1870. At the request of the college Mr. J. A. Venn has continued the record through the admissions of 1905, besides seeing Dr. Peile's manuscript through the press and preparing the index. The result of these labors of love is a collection of some ten thousand brief biographies. They abound in facts and dates rather than in characterizations; but a collection of even very compressed biographies of any ten thousand educated Englishmen makes a substantial contribution to English history. The great names are such as Grindall and Mildmay, Milton and Holles, Cudworth and Henry More, Paley and Darwin. But the American scholar will turn with equal interest to a series of names eminent in the early ecclesiastical history of New England and of Puritanism—Francis Johnson and John Smythe, William Perkins and William Ames, Ezekiel Rogers and Ralph Smith and John Allen of Dedham. Respecting some of these there are new facts.

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second. By Lord Macaulay. Edited by Charles Harding Firth, Regius Professor of Modern History, University of Oxford. Volume III. (London and New York, Macmillan, 1914, pp. xix, 1041–1532.) The third volume of Lord Macaulay's *History* as now published in its new and stately form fully bears out the promise of its two predecessors. More than a hundred and fifty illustrations, seven full-page plates in color, amply illustrate the narrative. Naturally as the story progresses the character of its illustrations tends to change. Most of the principal actors in the drama have been pictured; few of them had by 1689 left the stage; no great number of new figures had made their way to leading parts; and, in consequence, the portraits, while still numerous, begin to yield to other forms of illustration. Following the precedent set in the earlier volumes there appears a long array of documents, manuscripts, broadsides, and fugitive publications. The large number of reproductions of contemporary engravings is supplemented by photographs of still-standing memorials of the period, in particular the walls and guns which defended Londonderry in its famous siege. Of the colored plates—William, Mary, Dartmouth, Dorset, Burnet, Tyrconnell, and the Countess of Grammont—it is enough to say that though they do not yield in historic interest to some of their predecessors they are, with one or two exceptions, rather less decorative, and it is still too early to pass on the question of their selection. As to the text, beginning as it does with the rejoicings over the acquittal of the bishops which introduce chapter IX. and ending with the battle of Newtown Butler which concludes chapter XII., so covering the crisis of the Revolution, a word of quotation may prove interesting. In the possession of the reviewer, and so far as he is aware as yet unpublished, is an autograph letter of Macaulay's touching a part of this particular volume. "I hope", he writes December 3, 1853, "that early in 1855, I shall be able to publish two more volumes. I have little hope of being able to tell the story of the Irish wars in such a manner as to satisfy the bigots of any party. But I do not think that I shall be accused by any candid man of injustice towards the defenders of Londonderry." As one reads again the stirring passages with which this volume concludes, illuminated as they are by the illustrations which accompany them, the prophecy which inevitably comes to mind seems more than fulfilled.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

Figures du Passé: Dumouriez. Par Arthur Chuquet, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1914, pp. 287.) M. Chuquet's sketch of Dumouriez does not alter in its essential features a portrait with which the world has long been familiar. The hero of Valmy and Jemappes still seems to have possessed more ability than character and balance. In such a case it is important to fix the proportion between the qualities and the defects. M. Chuquet inclines to emphasize the

qualities. He believes that they were so brilliant as to justify the unmeasured ambition which Dumouriez appears to have cherished. The chief fault of Dumouriez in the author's estimation was "l'étourderie", which was the fault of his century. This blinded him to the difficulties of an enterprise, permitting him to see only its promise. Perhaps the impression that he was primarily an adventurer is due to the fact that the first two affairs in which he was engaged were the expedition to Corsica in 1768 and the mission to Poland two years later after the collapse of the Confederation of Bar.

M. Chuquet disposes rather summarily of the earlier part of the career of Dumouriez, devoting the greater part of the volume to his ministry, to the campaign in the Argonne, and to his attempt to overthrow the Convention. M. Chuquet brings out the fact, not sufficiently noticed hitherto, that Dumouriez was virtually minister of war while he was managing the foreign office. "Grave lui obéissait, comme un fils". From the first he planned to create a diversion by attacking the Austrian Netherlands. He did not believe that the new French army could successfully carry out defensive operations. It was, therefore, with great reluctance that in the summer, when he took Lafayette's place at the front, he consented to defer this project and to undertake to defend the road to Paris against the advancing Prussians. M. Chuquet makes very clear the real achievement of Dumouriez after Valmy. General Kellermann thought that the army should fall back behind the Marne and take up a strong defensive position. Servan, the minister of war, urged the same plan. This would have abandoned to the Prussians towns in which they might have easily established winter quarters. Dumouriez, however, refused to retreat, threatening the Prussian lines until Frederick William and Brunswick concluded to withdraw. It is unfortunate that M. Chuquet has not accompanied his description of these operations with maps. The reader unprovided with detailed military charts will be at a loss to locate many of the positions which are mentioned.

The later chapters of the book contain much new information about the writings of Dumouriez during his thirty years of exile. He was an unwearied apologist for his own career, and could never discover exactly why he had forfeited his claim to being a patriotic Frenchman.

H. E. B.

The Judicial Veto. By Horace A. Davis. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. vi, 148.) This volume contains three essays: the first discusses in an illuminating way the light-hearted readiness of courts to declare laws void; the second proposes a remedy for the existing practice, by proposing that in a formal review of the law the state be represented and that notice be given to the legislature which passed the law and to the public; the third, which was originally published in the *American Political Science Review,* purports to examine

the origin of the power of the United States Supreme Court to declare a law unconstitutional. A large portion of the volume is taken up with this third essay, which does not, however, really examine critically the origin of the power in question but is largely devoted to an attempt to show that the men in the ratifying state conventions did not on the whole intend to recognize or establish such power in the court.

It is difficult if not impossible to criticize justly the argument and method of the author in a brief notice; but it may not be unfair to say, first, that the power to declare laws void does not belong exclusively or peculiarly to the Federal Supreme Court, as a special tribunal set aside and aloft as a guardian of the Constitution. If one is interested in seeing the origin of judicial review, he is sure to be led astray by fixing his eyes upon that tribunal. Secondly, the author's contention that the early amendments, and notably the Tenth Amendment, were intended to restrain the court from declaring a law void appears extremely fanciful, inasmuch as the purpose of this amendment was to prevent the assumption of undue power by the federal government and this power of the court is also directed to prevent such assumption of power. Thirdly, to maintain that the Judiciary Act was phrased in such a way as implicitly to deny the power to the Supreme Court is to assume a position which all the clever argument of the author is far from establishing. It should be remembered that the particularists did not object to the power of the federal court to declare federal laws void—the more of such declarations the merrier—but to the possible absorption of general judicial authority, especially by the "inferior courts", at the expense of the state courts and, perhaps, to the federal power of reviewing state legislation.

A. C. McL.

The Wars between England and America. By Theodore Clarke Smith, Professor of American History, Williams College. [The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, no. 82.] (New York, Henry Holt and Company, London, Williams and Norgate, 1914, pp. viii, 256.) The title of this book is somewhat misleading. Those expecting to find much military history in it will be disappointed. It is virtually a résumé of American history from 1763 to the ratification of the treaty of Ghent in 1815, thus serving as a link between Andrews's *Colonial Period* and MacDonald's *From Jefferson to Lincoln* in the same series. The author has aimed primarily "to show how social, economic, and political causes led to a period of almost continuous antagonism between England and the American communities" during the interval. The Revolution and the War of 1812 give their names to the book "because they mark, in each case, the outcome of successive years of unavailing efforts on the part of each country to avoid bloodshed".

Professor Smith has carried out his main purpose admirably. The various elements of antagonism between England and America which led to two wars within the space of half a century have been described

clearly and concisely. If at times the narrative appears too condensed, the limitations of space must plead excuse. To relate within the compass of 250 pages the story of such an eventful epoch in American history as that from 1763 to 1815 with a proper distribution of emphasis and in a manner that will appeal not only to the specialist but to the general reader is no mean achievement, and the author deserves high praise for performing it so successfully.

Most striking are the chapters relative to the Revolution. The treatment is refreshingly unconventional. The able soldiership displayed by many of the British generals, the manifold difficulties under which they labored in conducting a war at a distance of three thousand miles from their base, the superior fighting qualities repeatedly shown by the British troops, receive an unaccustomed recognition. Mingled with it are many unpleasant truths regarding the character of the Continental forces. Unfortunately the account is not without blemishes. The characterization of Barrington as a man who "lacked force" will be disputed by those who have had occasion to study his manuscript papers as Secretary at War. The assertion that it was necessary to feed the British armies entirely from England deserves modification. While the bulk of the provisions came from the home country, there is ample evidence to show that very considerable quantities were obtained in the theatre of the war. Howe, and not Gage, entertained the idea of attacking Dorchester Heights in March, 1776.

To the brief but well-chosen bibliography Belcher's *First American Civil War* should be added.

EDWARD E. CURTIS.

The Political and Sectional Influence of the Public Lands (1828–1842). By Raynor G. Wellington, A.M., Assistant Professor of History, University of South Dakota. (Printed at the Riverside Press, 1914, pp. 131.) This monograph covers exhaustively the field described by its title, if this title be properly understood to be limited to political history. The importance of the relation of the congressional discussions over the public lands to those on the tariff, on finance, and on internal improvements of course has been duly appreciated before: but no writer has so minutely studied the complicated interactions, in their legislative history, of the pre-emption and graduation measures of Benton, the distribution scheme of Clay, and the proposal of Calhoun to cede to the Western states, upon conditions, the public lands within the limits of those states. The introduction connects the narrative with the earlier history of the public lands: two chapters treat of the tariff, the surplus, the independent treasury, the assumption of the debts of the states, and the public lands, with reference to the sectional character of votes in Congress and to the policies of public men and of the Whig and Democratic parties: two chapters deal particularly with the presidential election of 1840: and the conclusion suggests some of the bearings of this period upon that which

followed. Every important vote is analyzed from the geographical as well as from the party standpoint. In the cases of three typical measures—Benton's graduation bill of 1830, Bibb's resolutions, in 1832, for the reference to the Committee on Manufactures of Clay's resolutions of that year, and Berrien's amendment to Clay's distribution bill of 1841—the votes are plotted in map form. The bibliographical apparatus, the notes, and the index are adequate. The printing in general is well done: on page 41, however, what should be "unnecessary" appears as "necessary", to the confusion of the thought of a paragraph.

William Gray of Salem, Merchant: a Biographical Sketch. By Edward Gray. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. viii, 124.) The present work consists in an eighty-five-page biographical sketch of the sort that one finds in the better class of local historical society publications, liberally padded with some excellent illustrations and an appendix, and offered to the public in a limited edition at four dollars the copy. William Gray of Salem was the wealthiest shipowner and merchant in the United States in the first decade of the nineteenth century. He owned thirty-six vessels in 1809, and was worth three million dollars. Until 1808 he was a local leader of the Federalist party, but he supported Jefferson's embargo policy, was elected lieutenant-governor of Massachusetts on the Gerry ticket, and subscribed liberally to government loans during the year of 1812. For these unpardonable sins, he received the social ostracism that dominant New England Federalism knew well how to inflict. Timothy Pickering described Gray as a "man of unspotted character" in 1799, but in 1812 he called him "in private affairs a shuffler, in public affairs a contemptible trimmer" (pp. 25–26). No one can read Mr. Gray's sketch of his ancestor without concluding that Pickering's earlier judgment was the correct one.

Unfortunately all of William Gray's commercial papers have been destroyed, save one letter-book of the years 1809–1812. It is regrettable that Mr. Gray did not publish this *in extenso* instead of devoting his appendix to a list of his ancestor's vessels, and much of his text to personal and family detail. The few extracts that he has printed throw an interesting light on the range and variety of Massachusetts commerce during this troubled period. There are hundreds of such letter-books and thousands of bundles of commercial correspondence still preserved in the garrets of New England mercantile families. A concerted effort should be made by the principal historical societies of the New England states to collect, preserve, and in part publish this material, thus paving the way for a full and connected account of New England commerce in the early nineteenth century, corresponding to Mr. Weeden's work on the colonial period.

A History of Dartmouth College, 1815–1909. By John King Lord. Being the second volume of *A History of Dartmouth College and the Town of Hanover, New Hampshire,* begun by Frederick Chase. (Concord, N. H., the Rumford Press, 1913, pp. viii, 725.) When the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dartmouth College Case was announced, Francis Hopkinson wrote to President Brown, "I would have an inscription over the door of your building, 'Founded by Eleazar Wheelock, Refounded by Daniel Webster'". The words now appear at the entrance of Webster Hall, dedicated toward the close of President Tucker's administration. Mr. Chase's volume described the founding of the college by Eleazar Wheelock. Professor Lord's volume continues Dartmouth's history from the events which led to its "refounding" by Webster through the era of its rebuilding during the remarkably successful years of guidance under President Tucker. The author's training and qualifications for his task are obvious; a grandson of Dr. Nathan Lord, president from 1828 to 1863, an alumnus, a member of the faculty for many years, and twice acting president of the college, he knows its traditions, spirit, and newer aspirations. The expectations raised by the author's position are realized by the performance. Professor Lord has written a volume worthy of the college and an important chapter in the history of American education. Not less important is his contribution to the history of the Dartmouth College Case. Shirley's *Dartmouth College Causes* (a book long out of print and deserving of a new edition) was the result of painstaking investigations into the political and personal, as well as the constitutional, aspects of that great dispute. Professor Lord, whose position is naturally favorable to the college and hence opposed to Shirley's, goes fully into the beginnings of the matter and we are let into a somewhat petty contention over the control of the Hanover church, which split the community and the college. The Dartmouth College controversy was at first personal and theological (just which element preceded it is difficult to determine); it became political and ended as an important landmark in constitutional development. Depending upon the point of view it has been regarded as a contest between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, between conservatism and liberalism in theology, between aristocratic federalism and democracy, even between narrow-minded collegiate administration and academic freedom. All of these elements have much interest, but naturally fade before the constitutional importance of Webster's successful effort. There is another side to the picture which Professor Lord's sympathies have naturally led him to neglect: one wonders, after reading the account of Dartmouth's struggles as a small college for so many years after Webster had "refounded" it, what position in the history of American education Dartmouth might have taken had the state of New Hampshire been victorious. "Dartmouth University" under the control of New Hampshire as early as 1820 might have rendered to state and nation services different of course but possibly even greater than those which Dartmouth College

has actually performed, great as those have been. And the state would have vindicated a principle which Maitland has shown to be a vital one, the keeping of the corporation under the state's lock and key One may note, too, that the relations between the state and the college form a problem not yet solved.

Lack of space forbids consideration of other topics of interest: the Northern Academy of Arts and Sciences, the surprising pro-slavery sentiments of President Lord and their effect upon the college, the growth of alumni control in the face of the rigid provisions of the Wheelock charter as to the selection of trustees (provisions which have come to be almost a legal fiction), and the marvellous development under President Tucker. All have an appeal beyond the limits of an alumni circle. Dartmouth has her own history and in the two volumes by Chase and Lord we have that history well told.

Jesse S. Reeves.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, October, 1913–June, 1914. Volume XLVII. (Boston, the society, 1914, pp. xvi, 555.) Most of the matter which makes up this interesting volume has already been commented on, as it appeared serially from month to month, in the section of this journal devoted to historical news. It is noteworthy, to how large an extent the volumes of the society's proceedings are coming to consist of material relating to the nineteenth century, which until some five years ago had little place in the society's publications. Thus, the most noteworthy papers in the present volume are that of Mr. Edward Stanwood, on the history of reciprocity of trade with Canada, and that of Mr. Charles Francis Adams, entitled "A Crisis in Downing Street", in which he rewrites the history of English cabinet consultations and diplomacy respecting America in the autumn of 1862; while the three leading groups of documentary material in the volume are, a body of letters addressed to Jonathan Russell between 1801 and 1822, the letters of Elbridge Gerry in 1813 and 1814, and those of the Duke and Duchess of Argyll to Charles Sumner, 1861 to 1865. Mr. Curtis Guild's miscellaneous but interesting set of letters of the presidents belongs to the same period. Yet earlier centuries are not neglected, as witness the curious paper on witchcraft by Cotton Mather with critical annotations by Robert Calef which Mr. Worthington Ford has lately discovered; a group of papers from the British Museum exhibiting the relations between John Wilkes and Boston; and Professor Channing's paper on Washington and parties, 1789–1797.

Nantucket: a History. By R. A. Douglas-Lithgow, M.D., LL.D. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914, pp. xiii, 389.) This is the first comprehensive account of this well-known island since Obed Macy's *History of Nantucket,* first published in 1835. The author states in his foreword that a new history of a "popular character" has been

a general desire for some time past, and this is certainly just such a book. There are twenty chapters, covering a variety of topics. The first five treat of the geology and physiography of the island, its legends, the aborigines, early white settlers, and development. Chapters IX. and X. are on the nineteenth century and contain a heterogeneous mass of facts—not a continuous historical narrative, as the author himself admits. The remaining chapters are essays on subjects which have little connection with each other, several of them by other writers. The more important are those on the whale fishery, Quakerism, Nantucket records, eminent Nantucketers, life-saving service and wrecks, newspapers, flora, etc. The chief characteristic of the volume is the enormous amount of detail respecting families, houses, place-names, and facts of every conceivable kind, important and trivial. Much of this material is arranged in chronological order and gives one the impression that he is reading a diary or the local column of a country newspaper, rather than a history. Nevertheless some of the chapters are valuable, especially those on the early development of the island, Quakerism, and Nantucket records, and that on newspapers by Harry B. Turner. The chapter on Nantucket flora by Grace Brown Gardner is important and contains a fifteen-page list of the plants growing on the island. The volume is for the most part based on a large mass of first-hand material, though few citations are given. It is undoubtedly the best history of Nantucket yet written and must be read by all who wish to know the history, especially in the nineteenth century, of this unique community.

Marcus W. Jernegan.

Simeon North, First Official Pistol Maker of the United States: a Memoir. By S. N. D. North, LL.D., and Ralph H. North. (Concord, N. H., the Rumford Press, 1913, pp. xii, 207.) Colonel Simeon North (1765–1851) was an ingenious, capable, and public-spirited manufacturer of fire-arms, and a man of sterling character, whose word was as good as his bond. Few materials for his life exist, except an imperfect series in Washington archives of his correspondence and contracts with the federal government. Chiefly on the basis furnished by these, two of his great-grandsons have compiled this memoir, partly in order to do honor to his memory, and partly to illustrate the history of an interesting branch of Connecticut manufactures. The title of the book refers to Simeon North's position as the first, and for many years the sole, civilian maker of pistols for the United States government; for pistols, almost as many as he made, were manufactured in the government armories at Springfield and Harper's Ferry from 1795 on. North's contracts began in 1799. That of 1813 is noteworthy as being the first United States contract for fire-arms with interchangeable parts, such standardization, not before this applied to other varieties of manufacture, being made possible by North's inventions of appropriate machinery. Excellent illustrations show some of the models of the 50,000 pistols he made for the govern-

ment between 1799 and 1828, and of the 18,000 muskets he made between that date and 1851, when he died. His fifty years of work under government contracts were conducted to the entire satisfaction of the government, and without the need of controversy. They were fifty years of quiet and conscientious labors, fruitful in improvements of which the government reaped the benefits. An unpretending sketch, the book is interesting and, within its limited sphere, of decided value.

Pennsylvania, the Keystone: a Short History. By Samuel Whitaker Pennypacker, Governor of the Commonwealth, 1903–1907. (Philadelphia, Christopher Sower Company, 1914, pp. 316.) A former governor, ex-judge, and president of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania has written a very interesting short outline history of the Keystone State. Considerable merit attaches to the book from the fact that the author was not content to build merely on the work of others, but extracted much of his knowledge from the raw material, some printed and some in manuscript, seldom used. Foot-notes are rigidly excluded, because, as the author quotes, they encumber the pages "like barnacles on the keel of a vessel and delay progress". References may be out of place for a short and popular history, but the application of this principle to historiography in general is not sound. The bibliography, organized along most unorthodox lines, contains fifty-odd titles of which more than one-half refer to original materials. The story is told in plain and simple language, bringing to view many essential historical facts, including many new and curious data, interwoven with considerable anecdote and romance. There is little attempt at interpretation or expression of opinion. For the most part the facts are classified according to chronology or topic. Sixteen chapters trace the history of the state in its varied career from the foundation of the colony to the present. Thirteen chapters give the history of the separate subjects, slavery, art, literature, science, law, education, religion, natural resources, industrial development, and transportation. Curiously enough, agriculture and the industry of the thrifty "Dutch" farmer of the great central valley were not selected for separate treatment. The book contains over a hundred well-chosen illustrations.

Relatively more attention is given to the Germans and Quakers than to the Scotch-Irish. Swedish and Dutch settlements on the Delaware are each honored with a chapter, the Scotch-Irish none. Why an element in the population of such size and strength of character and of such great force in the history of both the state and nation should not be properly recognized, we do not presume to state. The author wrote his book with a purpose; local pride and patriotism have led him to select only those facts which display the state in her best clothes. In this view of history, it must be admitted, something of truth and accuracy is lost. It is true a beautiful capitol was built without taxing or borrowing, but why no mention of the scandalous misuse of the state's money in

building? There is no quarrel with the contrast made between the hearty response of Pennsylvania and the recalcitrant attitude of Massachusetts during the War of 1812. We do think it unfair, however, to fail to point out either the offensive conduct of Pennsylvania during the French and Indian War or the great energy shown then by the Bay Colony. We are curious to know why Franklin, James Wilson, and Albert Gallatin are not included along with Buchanan, Quay, Cameron, in the list of those who by force of character and intelligence dominated the affairs of the state. To say that James Wilson perhaps more than any other affected the results reached in the memorable convention of 1787 is to ignore the work of the master-builder, James Madison.

W. T. Root.

A History of the General Property Tax in Illinois. By Robert Murray Haig, Ph.D. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. III., nos. 1 and 2.] (Urbana, University of Illinois, 1914, pp. 235.) It is impossible in the course of a three or four hundred word review to do justice to a book of so many pages. The monograph of Mr. Haig is one of the many evidences of a larger interest in taxation stimulated by changing economic conditions. The states are coming to a realization of the absurdity of present methods, but an awakening of the people yet remains to be accomplished. Painstaking presentation of facts in a simple, straightforward way will help to do this. This, I take it, has been Mr. Haig's purpose.

Under the divisions of the Pre-Territorial Origin, the Formative Period, the Debt Paying Period and the Present Day Period the author, in twelve chapters, presents the prosaic, sordid story of taxation in Illinois. His conclusions are practically the same as those of every investigator in the tax history of our states. The catalogue of them includes gross undervaluation, lack of uniformity, lack of universality or completeness of assessment, and defective administration. What more could be wanted for an absurd fiscal policy?

The steps which may be taken in dealing with the situation are modified, unfortunately, by political conditions based upon the old motto "We know where we are now; why make any change?" But even this view does not prevent codification and simplification of the code and it ought not to stand too long against the establishment of a tax commission. No tax commission can get very far without coming flat against the old general property provisions in the constitutions. Segregation of state and local revenues would relieve both the state and the communities from many embarrassing things. The great dragon in the way is the corporation standing out against any change in the general property tax when applied to them in contrast to the individual who moves about on two feet. All of these proposals Mr. Haig brings out clearly in his concluding chapter. The book, if it could be forced into the eyesight of

political leaders, ought to bring at least some prickings of conscience over the barren waste in the Illinois fiscal policy.

FRANK L. MCVEY.

Semi-Centennial History of West Virginia. By James Morton Callahan, Professor of History and Political Science, West Virginia University. (Charleston, West Va., Semi-Centennial Commission of West Virginia, 1913, pp. ix, 594.) While the early settlement, the early industrial and social life, the historic highways, the first railroads, and the sectional contest between eastern and western Virginia are more attractively and scientifically presented than heretofore by any other author, the chief contributions of Professor Callahan's *Semi-Centennial History* are to be found in the chapters upon the period since the Civil War. It is in these and by the use of carefully selected data illustrated by numerous maps, that the story of the industrial and political awakening of West Virginia is told; that one sees those earlier pioneer ideals, determined largely by experiences under frontier conditions and by contact with the mother-state, break down, giving away to new enterprises, new problems, new hopes, and new ambitions, which collectively made impossible all subsequent attempts to reunite the Virginias and gave West Virginia an identity peculiarly her own. Conceived as they generally are in the minds of politicians and executed by their zealous but ill-informed henchmen, such patriotic productions as this one rarely contain much that is either accurate or worth while, but, fortunately for the much neglected field of which it treats and for those who will be influenced by its scientific methods, this volume is the work of a master. It should and doubtless will soon displace the older and less scientific histories of West Virginia.

An interesting feature of the book, one of great value to scholars and researchers, is its numerous and in some instances rare maps. Beginning with a map of the District of Augusta and following with one of the later mother-counties of 1790, practically every important phase of the industrial and political development of the state from that time to the present is illustrated either by drawings by the author or by reproductions of maps in the Library of Congress. Those covering the period since the formation of the state suggest many fruitful topics of research in its modern political and industrial development. The main historical narrative, consisting of over half the volume, is followed by an extensive bibliography, a comprehensive subject-index, and about thirty special articles upon such topics as education, transportation, mineral resources, taxation, horticulture, etc.

CHARLES H. AMBLER.

The Establishment of State Government in California, 1846–1850. By Cardinal Goodwin, M.A. (New York, the Macmillan Company, 1914, pp. xiv, 359.) Mr. Goodwin belongs to that group of younger

scholars who, under direction of Professor Herbert E. Bolton, have been making fresh researches in the Bancroft Collection, University of California. His contributions to *Overland Monthly* and the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* are forerunners of this book, which covers with painstaking detail the political aspects of California history during the eventful years 1846–1850. "The Interregnum", "The Constitutional Convention", and "The Organization of State Government", are the divisions treated in a total of nineteen chapters.

The book reflects the spirit of dispassionate investigation, the author making extensive use of the sources and showing acquaintance with a wide range of secondary writers. His method almost precludes the possibility of literary style and makes it difficult to preserve true perspective. Conscientious regard for technique is everywhere evidenced.

Perhaps the chief specific contribution is in adducing the evidence to show that, contrary to the commonly accepted view, the delegates in the Constitutional Convention who advocated the wide eastern boundary for California were not a group of southern men conspiring to form a state so vast that subsequent division by an east-and-west line into two states would prove necessary. The evidence goes to show it was not sectionalism but a "desire to obtain immediate admission to statehood" that prompted the delegates (p. 174).

Models for California were found in the constitutions of Iowa and New York, and the constitutions of "twenty individual states were cited during the proceedings of the Convention" (p. 237). Honorable John Currey, former chief justice of the supreme court of California, in a personal letter to the present reviewer, speaks of loaning a volume containing the constitutions of all thirty states to a delegate (probably Lippitt), and adds: "That it was used in the Convention I do not doubt".

A few typographical errors are noted: as in spelling *diputacion* (p. 9), Pedrorena (pp. 84, 128), and Botts' (p. 203); use of the wrong numeral for a second foot-note (p. 137); omission of volume-number in citation to Bancroft (p. 219), and to Hittell (p. 224). The index should be more complete. Thus one looks in vain for such important names as Halleck, Lippitt, Benton, Clay, President Taylor.

Mr. Goodwin is tempted at times to go too far afield, as in devoting generous space to the Panic of 1837 (pp. 175–177), and congressional land grants for educational purposes (pp. 198 ff.). The book would have been improved if the author had better succeeded in the difficult task of weaving all into more readable narrative. Nevertheless it will prove a welcome and valuable contribution towards the preparation of the worthy history of California—which has not yet been written.

ROCKWELL D. HUNT.

The Descendants of Jöran Kyn of New Sweden. By Gregory B. Keen, LL.D. (Philadelphia, the Swedish Colonial Society, 1913, pp. 318.) Jöran Kyn, commonly called Jöran Snöhuitt ("Snow-white"),

was a Swedish colonist who arrived in New Sweden with Governor Johan Printz in 1643 and became the chief proprietor of land at Upland, now Chester, Pennsylvania, but was not otherwise conspicuous. In volumes II.–VII. of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (1878–1883) Dr. Keen published a series of genealogical articles upon the descendants of this patriarch. These articles have long been recognized as of high merit, partly on the ordinary grounds of genealogical accuracy and fulness, but mainly because of the great amount of interesting biographical detail respecting not only the descendants of Jöran Kyn, but all manner of important persons in the colonies of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware who intermarried with such descendants or were related to them. These articles Dr. Keen, vice-president of the new Swedish Colonial Society, has now combined into a volume for that society. It supplies the largest amount of information accessible in print respecting any section of the Swedish population on the Delaware River after the times of Swedish rule. For instance, Jöran Kyn's descendants in the sixth generation (beyond which the compilation does not extend) numbered not less than 264, and no doubt at the present time his descendants may be counted by thousands, furnishing a striking example of the wide diffusion of blood of an early Swedish settler on the Delaware. Also many colonial worthies of English and other descent have their record in the book. The compiler states that many additions have been made to what was printed in the original articles in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, and this seems to be the case; but he also says that no attempt has been made to introduce information derived from Dr. Amandus Johnson's *Swedish Settlements on the Delaware*, previously published by the same society, and this is a distinct defect, since that book contains many data which might profitably have been worked into this compilation.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Association holds its annual meeting, with an attractive programme, in Chicago on December 29, 30, and 31. The usual article descriptive of the meeting will appear in our next number. The Executive Council, at its preliminary meeting of November 28, voted to recommend that the meeting of December, 1916, be held in Cincinnati; that of 1915 is by vote of the Association to be held in Washington. It was reported that war conditions compel for the present a suspension of activity in the preparation of the Bibliography of Modern English History.

The Pacific Coast Branch held its autumn meeting in San Francisco in the last days of November. The intercalary meeting which the American Historical Association is to hold on the Pacific Slope in 1915 has been fixed for the three days July 21 (San Francisco), 22 (Berkeley), 23 (Palo Alto), with an opening meeting on the evening of July 20. The programme is expected to be devoted specifically to the history of the Pacific Ocean and the various countries upon its shores.

The first volume of the *Annual Report* for 1913 is in galley-proof; the second volume, Papers of James A. Bayard, edited by Miss Elizabeth P. Donnan, is nearly ready for the press. The next report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission will contain the extant papers of R. M. T. Hunter, with perhaps other Virginian papers of his time.

The manuscript of the annual bibliography, *Writings on American History, 1913,* prepared by Miss Grace G. Griffin, has gone to the Yale University Press. In order that continuance of publication by that press may be ensured, members are earnestly reminded that a large increase of sales of the volume for 1912 is requisite.

In the *Original Narratives* series, publication of *Narratives of the Insurrections* has, by a mishap to the index, been deferred to the spring.

In the September number of the *History Teacher's Magazine,* Dr. R. V. D. Magoffin commences a series of articles on the Teaching of Roman History, with a chapter on the Archaeological History of Rome after 450 B. C.; Professor William F. Russell contributes an historical account of the Early Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, while the editor makes sagacious and timely observations on the European War and History Teachers. In the October issue are to be noted "Early Rome and Italy", by Professor G. W. Botsford, "A Single Aim in His-

tory Teaching", by Leroy F. Jackson, and a group of personal letters of Elihu B. Washburne, written in 1870–1871 while he was minister (not "ambassador") of the United States in Paris. The number for November is notable, apart from its leading article, Greek Civilization in the Roman Empire by Professor W. L. Westermann, for a paper by Mr. David Snedden, commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, on the Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, with a reply by Professor George L. Burr on "What History shall we Teach?" In the issue of December are articles by Professor P. Orman Ray on "Topics of State History fruitful for Research", by Professor L. B. Smith on the Place of History in a Technical School, and by Moses W. Ware, "A Side Light on the War of 1812".

PERSONAL

Rear-Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, U. S. N. retired, died on December 1 at Washington, where he had in November begun a period of association with the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Born in 1840 at West Point, the son of a distinguished professor of engineering familiar with French systems of scientific education, he was early trained to that remarkable clearness and directness of thought and expression which always distinguished him. His naval career, from the time of his entrance into the Naval Academy in 1856, has been described by himself, modestly but with great interest and in its proper setting of American naval history, in a most enjoyable book of reminiscences entitled *From Sail to Steam* (1907). In this he has described how the reading of Napier, the writing of a book on *The Gulf and Inland Waters* in our Civil War, and the call to lecture on naval history at the Naval War College founded in 1885, turned him to the career of the historian. His first great work, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660–1783* (1890), may fairly be said to have achieved a greater influence upon the public mind of Europe and America than any other historical book of our generation. However largely the contemporary state of Europe may be responsible for such an effect, the book deserved its success when considered solely from the point of view of the historian, for the power of lucid thought, the penetration and insight, with which Captain Mahan extracted the meaning from history, are rare and impressive gifts, and his style, sinewy, direct, and simple, yet cultivated, was suited to the workings of a strong mind dealing with momentous themes. The same qualities, with fuller opportunities for research, marked *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire* (1892), *The Life of Nelson, the Embodiment of the Sea Power of Great Britain* (1897), and *Sea Power in its Relations to the War of 1812* (1905); but his first book had made his reputation secure. The fresh vista which it had opened into history could never be closed. In 1902 he was president of the American Historical Association. It was characteristic, that he chose as the theme of his presidential address Subordination in His-

torical Treatment, the necessity and method of such grouping and emphasis as should present in truthful proportions the central elements of the historian's thought. Admiral Mahan was a man of elevated and religious character, of profitable and delightful conversation, modest, courteous, and lovable.

Professor Reinhold Koser of Berlin died in that city on August 25, 1914, at the age of sixty-two years. He was general director of the Prussian State Archives, and had published numerous works relating to Brandenburg-Prussia and the Hohenzollerns, the most important being his *Geschichte Friedrichs des Grossen.*

Georges Perrot, perpetual secretary of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, and joint author with the late Charles Chipiez of the well-known *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*, died in the last days of June, at the age of eighty-one.

William Nelson, for more than thirty years corresponding secretary of the New Jersey Historical Society, died on August 10, at the age of sixty-seven. On the history of New Jersey there was no higher authority. Besides many other useful publications in that field, and in that of the history and bibliography of early American newspapers, he had edited nearly all the volumes of the *New Jersey Archives.*

Miss Margaret S. Morriss has been promoted to an assistant professorship in history at Mt. Holyoke College.

Dr. Annie Heloise Abel has been appointed to a full professorship of history in Goucher College.

Mr. Morgan P. Robinson has been elected archivist of the Virginia State Library, assuming the duties of that office on January 1, 1915.

Dr. Robert G. Caldwell has been appointed assistant professor of history at Rice Institute, Houston, Texas.

Professor David L. Patterson of the University of Kansas is supplying the place of Professor A. L. P. Dennis of the University of Wisconsin during the present academic year.

GENERAL

Professor F. K. Ginzel of the Prussian Institute for Astronomical Calculations has issued a third volume, concluding his *Handbuch der Mathematischen und Technischen Chronologie, das Zeitrechnungswesen der Völker* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914, pp. vii, 445), which contains a mass of information useful to the historian in solving the intricate and unusual problems of chronology.

Messrs. Putnam are shortly to publish a volume by Miss Ruth Putnam on *Alsace and Lorraine from Caesar to Kaiser, 57 B. C.—1871 A. D.*, a study dealing with the political affiliations of the provinces throughout their history.

Art and Archaeology in its November number presents, in its series upon Masterpieces of Aboriginal American Art by Professor W. H. Holmes, an illustrated account of minor examples of mosaic work; and has also an illustrated account of the German excavations at Baalbek, by Professor L. B. Paton.

The October and November *Bulletins* of the New York Public Library continue its check-list of newspapers and official gazettes to the section for Virginia, and its list of works relating to Scotland through the economic and sociological sections. The library has also issued a *List of Works relating to the History and Condition of the Jews in various Countries* (pp. 278), extracted from a series of its *Bulletins*.

Numerous articles have appeared in recent months regarding the superstition about ritual murder by the Jews, and an exhaustive investigation of the subject can now be found in *Le Crime Rituel chez les Juifs* (Paris, Téqui, 1914, pp. 376) by A. Monniot.

The *Biblioteca Coloniale*, to be published by Signor Barbera, Florence, opens with the first volume of the *Storia del Commercio*, by Gino Luzzatto. This volume begins with ancient times and comes down to the Renaissance. The work will be complete in two volumes.

War's Aftermath: a preliminary Study of the Eugenics of War as illustrated by the Civil War of the United States and the late Wars in the Balkans, by Dr. David Starr Jordan and Harvey E. Jordan, is more particularly a study, confessedly tentative and somewhat lacking in definite scientific results, of the effect of the Civil War upon the quality of manhood in the South (Houghton Mifflin Company).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. H. Hull, *The Service of Statistics to History* (Quarterly Publication of the American Statistical Association, March); A. Cavalli, *Il Fenomeno Associativo dai "Collegia" Antichi alle "Corporazioni" Medioevali*, I. (Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali e Discipline Ausiliarie, October); M. Vauthier, *La Doctrine du Contrat Social* (Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, May).

ANCIENT HISTORY

Outlines of Ancient History from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West, A. D. 476, by Harold Mattingly (Cambridge University Press, pp. 458) is a very compressed narrative, said to attain a high standard of accuracy.

The Macmillan Company are shortly to publish a "General Index" to Dr. J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough* series.

Messrs. Williams and Norgate announce a volume on the *Antiquity of Man*, by Professor Arthur Keith.

The Princeton University Press has brought out *Biblical Libraries: a Sketch of Library History from 3400 B. C. to A. D. 150,* by E. C. Richardson, librarian of Princeton University.

Dr. E. A. Wallis Budge has recently published two brief treatises, popular in character, and perhaps somewhat hasty in workmanship, yet representing much learning, *A History of the Egyptian People,* and *The Literature of the Egyptian People.*

An elaborate volume by D. Mallet is devoted to *Les Premiers Établissements des Grecs en Égypte, VII^e^ et VI^e^ Siècles* (Paris, Leroux, 1914).

Dr. D. G. Hogarth is the author of a recent addition to the *Home University Library, The Ancient East,* which covers the history of Western Asia between 1000 B. C. and the conquests of Alexander.

Mr. S. Langdon, in *Tammuz and Ishtar* (Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. 208) presents a monograph upon Babylonian religion and theology containing extensive extracts from the Tammuz liturgies and the whole of the Arbela oracles.

Important contributions to Greek history are made by A. Ledl, *Studien zur aelteren Athenischen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1914); Paul Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis* (Paris, Picard, 1914); and E. Pokarny, *Studien zur Griechischen Geschichte im Sechsten und Fünften Jahrzehnt des Vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Griefswald, 1914, pp. 167).

The *Loeb Classical Library* has added two new volumes recently, vol. II. of Suetonius, translated by Professor J. C. Rolfe, and the first volume of a two-volume edition of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* by Mr. Walter Miller.

L'Hellénisation du Monde Antique (Paris, Alcan, 1914) contains a series of illuminating lectures by V. Chapot, G. Colin, A. Croiset, J. Hatzfeld, A. Jardé, P. Jouguet, G. Leroux, A. Reinach, and T. Reinach delivered at the School of Higher Social Studies in Paris.

A. W. Pickard-Cambridge of Balliol College, Oxford, is the author of one of the latest additions to the *Heroes of the Nations* series, *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom* (Putnam).

The July–September number of the *American Journal of Archaeology* contains, from the hands of Messrs. W. H. Buckler and David N. Robinson, the text, translation, and an elaborate description of and commentary upon a Greek inscription from Sardes, setting forth honors received by one Menogenes, 6–1 B. C., and casting light on municipal government in Sardes and on the union of cities of Asia under Augustus. This is followed by Professor Colburn's third article on Lanuvium.

There is now available a second, revised and enlarged edition of G. Dottin, *Manuel pour servir à l'Étude de l'Antiquité Celtique* (Paris,

Champion, 1914, pp. 500). Still another useful volume for the prehistoric period is Feldhaus, *Die Technik der Vorzeit, der Geschichtlichen Zeit, und der Naturvölker* (Leipzig, Engelmann, 1914).

Under the title *À travers le Monde Romain* (Paris, Fontemoing) Professor René Cagnat of the French Institute publishes lectures given by him at the Musée Guimet, dealing vividly with some aspects of Roman civilization.

A well-made book of distinctly popular character is *Republican Rome*, by H. L. Havell, the second of the *Great Nations* series, published by Stokes and Company.

Dr. W. Brewitz, *Scipio Africanus Maior in Spanien, 210–206* (Tübingen, Laupp, 1914, pp. viii, 86) is a doctoral dissertation. An elaborate folio volume, with various maps, on *Die Keltiberer und ihre Kriege mit Rom* (Munich, Bruckmann, 1914) is by A. Schulten.

Dr. W. Warde Fowler has followed his general work on the religious ideas of the Romans by a special study on *Roman Ideas of Deity in the Last Century before the Christian Era*, which consists of lectures delivered at Oxford (Macmillan).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. W. von Bissing, *Denkmäler zur Geschichte des Kunst Amenophis IV.* (Sitzungsberichte der K. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., 1914, 3); H. Vincent, *Gézer et l'Archéologie Palestinienne après six Ans de Fouilles*, I. (Revue Biblique, July); H. Treidler, *Die Skythen und ihre Nachbarvölker* (Archiv für Anthropologie, XLI. 3); S. Heinlein, *Der Wirtschaftliche Niedergang Ioniens und der Ionische Aufstand* (Ungarische Rundschau, July); F. M. T. Böhl, *Die Juden im Urteil der Griechischen und Römischen Schriftsteller* (Theologisch Tijdschrift, XLVIII. 5).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

General reviews: W. Bauer, *Neues Testament, Apostelgeschichte und Apostolisches Zeitalter* (Theologische Rundschau, June); E. Klostermann, *Kirchengeschichte, Altchristliche Litteratur*, II., ibid.).

The twenty-seventh *Beiheft* of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* contains a collection of *Studien zur Semitischen Philologie und Religionsgeschichte* dedicated to Professor Julius Wellhausen on his seventieth birthday, May 17, 1914. Among the twenty-one papers are: A. A. Bevan, "Mohammed's Ascension to Heaven"; K. Budde, "Zur Geschichte des Buches Amos"; C. F. Burney, "The Topography of Gideon's Rout of the Midianites"; P. Haupt, "Die Schlacht von Taanach"; J. Meinhold, "Zur Frage der Kultuszentralisation"; R. W. Rogers, "Sennacherib and Judah", and A. Rahlfs, "Verzeichnis der Schriften Julius Wellhausens".

The Bampton Lectures for 1913, *The Church in Rome in the First Century*, by Rev. George Edmundson (Longmans), adhere to the tradi-

tion of St. Peter's visit to Rome in 42 and trace with much detail his subsequent movements.

Two more fascicles have been added to Cuthbert H. Turner's *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* (Oxford University Press), the first containing documents relating to the Council of Nicaea, the second the acts of the councils of Gangra and Antioch.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Erbes, *Die Zeit des Muratorischen Fragments* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXV. 3); P. Corssen, *Das Martyrium des Bischofs Cyprian,* I. (Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XV. 3); W. Soltau, *Das Pontifikale Jahrbuch und seine Rekonstruction* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 3); C. Guignebert, *Le Dogme de la Trinité,* I–IV. (Scientia, XXXII., XXXIII., XXXVII.).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

When the war broke out, steps had been lately taken toward the creation in Rome, on the model of existing national historical institutions, of an Hungarian Historical Institute, on governmental foundation but helped by the munificence of Mgr. Fráknoi, and toward the enlargement of the existing Bohemian mission into a permanent Bohemian Historical Institute; but it is not known whether these projects can now be pursued.

Mr. George W. Robinson, secretary of the Harvard Graduate School, has prepared the first English translation of *Eugippius: the Life of Saint Severinus,* which may be had from the University Press.

P. Noailles, in the first part of his *Les Collections de Novelles de l'Empereur Justinien,* dealt with *Origine et Formation sous Justinien* (Paris, Recueil Sirey, 1912, pp. xx, 267), and in the second part has published *La Collection Grecque des 168 Novelles* (Bordeaux, Cadoret, 1914, pp. 212).

The period from 750 to the Concordat of Worms in 1122 is dealt with in the first volume, and the ensuing period to the middle of the fourteenth century in the second volume of E. Eichmann, *Kirche und Staat* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1912, 1914) in *Quellensammlung zur Kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht.*

A Problem in the Use of Parallel Source Material in Medieval History: the Capture of Jerusalem in 1099, by Dr. Frederic Duncalf of the University of Texas, is a suggestive essay on the use of sources (*Bulletin of the University of Texas,* no. 224).

A recent publication of the Görres Gesellschaft is the first volume of F. E. Schneider, *Die Römische Rota* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Seckel, *Studien zu Benedictus Levita,* VIII. (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für aeltere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXXIX. 2); De Boor, *Suidas und die Exzerptsammlung,*

II. (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXIII. 1); J. Martin, *Les Italiens en Grèce et dans les Iles après les Croisades* [conclusion] (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 2); N. Paulus, *Der Hauptschädling des Ablasses im Mittelalter* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXV. 3).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: W. Köhler, *Kirchengeschichte, Neuere Kirchengeschichte, Reformationszeit* (Theologische Rundschau, July, August).

The Arnold Prize Essay for 1914 is *Elizabeth and Henry IV.*, by J. B. Black, "a study in Anglo-French Relations, 1589–1603".

A recent volume by Sandonnini gives an account of *Il Generale Raimondo Montecuccoli e la sua Famiglia* (Modena, Ferraguti, 1914).

George G. Butler is the editor of *A Journal of the First Two Campaigns of the Seven Years' War* by Horace St. Paul, aide-de-camp and colonel of cavalry in the Austrian army (Cambridge University Press).

The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xiii, 478), by Professor William E. Mead of Wesleyan University, combines in an uncommon degree interest and scholarship. Attention is centred on France, Italy, and Germany, with some reference to the Low Countries, Switzerland, and Spain. There are chapters on water travel, roads, carriages, inns, the cost of travel, its dangers and annoyances, and other topics, all supported by abundant citations of authorities, and illustrated from contemporary prints.

The fifth volume of Professor Oman's *History of the Peninsular War* (Oxford University Press) covers the years 1811–1812.

The August 1 issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica* was a number prepared in commemoration of the centenary of the restoration of the Society of Jesus in 1914. Among the volumes recently issued on the history of the society during the century are P. Albers, *Liber Saecularis, Historiae Societatis Jesu ab anno 1814 ad annum 1914* (Rome, 1914); J. Bournichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France, Histoire d'un Siècle* (vol. I., already mentioned, Paris, Beauchesne, 1914, pp. xlvi, 568); and P. Lesmes Frias, *La Provincia de España de la Compañia de Jesus, 1815–1863* (Madrid, Rivadeneyra, 1914, pp. 254). A comprehensive history of *I Gesuiti dalle Origini ai nostri Giorni* (Rome, *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1914, pp. 600) is the work of E. Rosa. All of the above authors are members of the society.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Griselle (*Le Prince de Galles et l'Alliance Anglaise au Temps de Henri IV. et de Louis XIII.* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 1); G. Guillot, *Un Témoin Italien de la Guerre des Impériaux contre les Turcs, 1683* (*ibid.*); J. F. Chance, *The Treaty of Hanover* (English Historical Review, October); A. de Curzon, *L'Ambassade du Comte des Alleurs à Constantinople, 1747–1754*

(Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 3); A. Auzoux, *Un Incident Diplomatique entre l'Espagne et le Directoire, 1798–1799* (Revue des Études Historiques, May); L. B. Jackes, *Ghent and the Treaty* (Canadian Magazine, December); L. Pingaud, *Alexandre Ier et Metternich d'après les Rapports de Lebzeltern, 1816–1826* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 2); A. Bourguet, *La France et la Russie de 1848 à 1854* (*ibid.*); E. Daudet, *À Travers les Origines d'une Guerre* [1870–1871] (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15).

THE GREAT WAR

[An historical journal of scientific aims may hesitate to take note of the swarm of ephemeral publications which assume to relate the history of the present war before it is anywise possible to do so; but collections of official documents have a permanent value, and certain other books, from their character or the standing of their authors, seem to deserve that the student's attention should be directed to them.]

First in date among the collections of official documents relating to the outbreak of hostilities may be placed the British "White Paper", *Correspondence respecting the European Crisis* ("Papers by Command, 7467, Miscellaneous, No. 6, 1914"), despatches and telegrams bearing date from July 20 to August 4, and the supplements (Cd. 7445, 7596, "Miscellaneous, Nos. 8 and 10") containing Sir E. Goschen's despatch dated London, August 8, and that of Sir Maurice de Bunsen dated London, September 1. The octavo blue-book *Great Britain and the European Crisis* (pp. 144), contains all these together with speeches of Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Asquith, August 3–6. The German "White Book" was issued both in German and in an authorized English translation, *Germany's Reasons for War with Russia* (Berlin, Liebheit), official narrative with documents. The Russian "Orange Book" appears in both French and English in the British publication *Documents respecting the Negotiations preceding the War, published by the Russian Government* (Cd. 7626, "Miscellaneous, No. 11"), the "Gray Paper" of Belgium in French and English, in *Diplomatic Correspondence respecting the War published by the Belgian Government* (Cd. 7627, "Miscellaneous, No. 12"). More recently the British government has also issued *Correspondence respecting Events leading to the Rupture of Relations with Turkey* (Cd. 7628, "Miscellaneous, No. 13"), and as we go to press we receive the French government's "Yellow Book", *Documents Diplomatiques*, etc., which takes a wider range than the preceding, especially with respect to events before July, 1914.

The "White Papers" of England and Germany, the "Orange Paper" of Russia and "Gray Paper" of Belgium, and some other diplomatic documents relating to the war, have been reprinted from the *New York*

Times in a convenient booklet. The *Times* also issues an English translation of the French "Yellow Book". The German book and nearly all of the Russian are reprinted in *Why We Are at War* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 251), by six members of the Oxford faculty of modern history.

The issues of *International Conciliation* for October and November (nos. 83 and 84) are occupied with official documents bearing upon the European war.

The English Historical Association has published, as Leaflet no. 36, *History of the Present War,* an eight-page bibliography for the use of teachers of history. Another, by Professor Clarence Perkins, appears in the *History Teacher's Magazine* for November.

Guerre de 1914: Documents Officiels, Textes, Législatifs et Réglementaires (Paris, Dalloz, 1914) is a pamphlet of the laws and ordinances especially applicable to France when entering upon the state of war. It will be supplemented by further issues. The historical section of the French General Staff issued near the outbreak of war a third edition of Lieutenant Jacomet, *Les Lois de la Guerre Continentale* (Paris, Fournier, 1914, pp. 160).

Professor Albert Bushnell Hart's *The War in Europe* (Appleton, pp. 254) is an excellent book of its class. In a plain and simple manner, adapted to the uses of the general reader, and in a clear arrangement, it treats of the resources, aims, and difficulties of the larger and smaller European powers, of considerations of race, and of military and economic rivalries, as conditions of the great struggle, and sets forth the manner in which the war began, the leading questions of international law and policy which are involved, and the probable results of the struggle to America and to the rest of the world. All is treated with wide and solid information, with sound judgment, with an excellent spirit of impartiality, and with restraint as to prediction.

Dr. J. Holland Rose has been delivering at Cambridge University a series of lectures on *The Origins of the War,* which have just been published by the University Press.

Gabriel Hanotaux is writing the text for an *Histoire Illustrée de la Guerre de 1914* (Paris, Nilsson) which is appearing in weekly parts at one franc each. A similar publication in sixty-centime parts is *Pages d'Histoire, 1914* (Paris, Berger-Levrault). The *Deutsche Geschichtskalender* is appearing with the subtitle *Der Europäische Krieg in Aktenmässiger Darstellung,* prepared by Dr. Fiedrich Purlitz. The *Revue de Hongrie* (Budapest) beginning with September is "entièrement consacrée à la Guerre", and is a vehement presentation of the Austro-Hungarian views. The September issue of the *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* is a "Nationale Kundgebung Deutscher und Oesterreichischer Historiker", with articles by Marcks, Meinecke, Oncken, Lenz, and others.

A pamphlet entitled *Truth about Germany* having been issued by a committee of representative Germans, and having somewhat the status of an official German justification of the war, Mr. Douglas Sladen has issued in reply a volume entitled *The Real "Truth about Germany": Facts about the War,* which presents the paragraphs of the German publication in English translation and follows each paragraph with controverting comment. While in the main the book is merely controversial, and as such may be thought to fall outside the sphere of this journal, there are a sufficient number of documents quoted in the course of the debate to give the book, though published near the beginning of the war, a certain amount of historical value.

The Frederick A. Stokes Company have published in a small volume *Treitschke: Selections from Lectures on Politics,* intended to illustrate the influence of that historian and publicist upon German thought and upon the present war. Messrs. Putnam also have published a book on *Treitschke: his Life and Work,* by Adolf Hausrath, consisting of a critical and biographical sketch by this intimate friend, and of nine essays by Treitschke containing the essentials of his doctrine of German policy, the substance of which had already been made known to those who do not read German by the late Professor Cramb's four lectures entitled *Germany and England* (Dutton).

Several volumes on the relations between France and Germany were published within the year preceding the outbreak of the present war and possess a consequent interest. *France et Allemagne, 1870–1913* (Paris, Perrin, 1913, pp. viii, 307) is a good survey of events from the French point of view by R. Pinon. Other books are L. Bruneau, *L'Allemagne en France* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. 340); G. Aubert, *La Folie Franco-Allemande: Étude Contemporaine, 1914* (Paris, Flammarion, 1914, pp. xvi, 284); and M. Leroy, *L'Alsace-Lorraine, Porte de France, Porte d'Allemagne* (Paris, Ollendorff, 1914). To these may be added a volume on *France et Suisse* (Paris, Perrin, 1914) by H. Moro.

Some idea of the German view of England and of the rivalry between the two countries may be obtained from E. Sieper, *Die Wirtschaftliche Rivalität zwischen Deutschland und England* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1914, pp. 21); from H. A. Walter, *Die Neuere Englische Sozial-Politik* (*ibid.,* pp. xxiv, 179), which has an introduction by Mr. Lloyd George, and is the sixth volume of Sieper's *Die Kultur des Modernen Englands,* a publication with pacifist tendencies; from W. Franz, *Britische Kulturkraft im Dienste National-Deutschen Arbeit* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1914, pp. iv, 67); and from M. Herggelet, *Ueber die Wahrscheinlichkeit eines Krieges zwischen Deutschland und England und über die Zukunft der beiden Länder* (Leipzig, Weigand, 1914, pp. 110), which is an attack on Sir Edward Grey, by a German who has lived fifteen years in England.

Rather more than the usual interest in a doctor's thesis attaches to *Die Neutralisation von Staaten insbesondere die der Schweiz, Belgiens, Luxemburgs, und des früheren Kongostaates* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1913, pp. xvii, 252), by S. Richter. *Die Grossmächte der Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. iii, 208), by Professor J. R. Kjellén of the University of Gothenburg, is a good survey written just before the war. The problems of international law involved in *Des Cessions de Territoires envisagées dans leur Principe et dans leurs Effets relatifs au Changement de Souveraineté et de Nationalité* (Paris, Rivière, 1914, pp. 236) have been studied by M. Costes. The financial problems are dealt with in A. Landry and B. Nogaro, *La Crise des Finances Publiques en France, en Angleterre, en Allemagne* (Paris, Alcan, 1914), and M. Évesque, *Les Finances de Guerre au XX^e^ Siècle* (*ibid.*, pp. xi, 707), both of which appeared before the war. The labor side of the problem was discussed by P. Louis, *Le Syndicalisme Européen* (*ibid.*). Among the discussions of military problems which appeared shortly before the beginning of hostilities were *Études sur l'Avant-Guerre* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914) issued by the historical section of the French General Staff; and Lieutenant-Colonel H. Mordacq, *La Guerre au XX^e^ Siècle: Essais Stratégiques* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914, pp. xiii, 304), the individual essays being entitled Étude Théorique d'une Situation Stratégique; Les Prodromes de Moukden; La Stratégie et la Cavalerie; La Stratégie et les Places Fortes; Stratégie Navale et Stratégie Terrestre—la Doctrine une; and La Durée Probable de la Prochaine Guerre.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: X., *La Lotta Nazionale Serba fra gli Slavi Meridionali dell' Austria-Ungheria* (Nuova Antologia, October); H. Delbrück, *Die Kriegsgefahr* [dated 26 July] (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); Prince Kotschubei, *Das Problem der Triple-Entente: der Russische Gesichtspunkt* (*ibid.*, September); F. J. Schmidt, *Das Ethos des Politischen Gleichgewichtsgedankens* (*ibid.*, October).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The *Second Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records*, marked as volume II., part I., of the Commission (Cd. 7544), a blue-book of great interest to historical students, treats, with the same intelligent care as its predecessor, the constitution and contents of various public archives situated outside the Public Record Office, the treatment and public use of their papers, and the publications which have been made from them, and concludes with important recommendations.

The Royal Historical Society has moved to more commodious quarters at 22 Russell Square, Bloomsbury, London. Its programme for the session 1914–1915 is as follows: "The Despenser War in Glamorgan", by J. Conway Davies: "The Causes of the Anglo-German Hostilities in 1914, from the historian's point of view", by Dr. G. W. Prothero; "A French Provincial Assembly during the League", by Maurice Wilkinson;

"Some Unpublished Privy Seal Docquets of the Civil War Time", by Hilary Jenkinson and H. Symonds; "The Spanish Municipal Administration in South America, 1500–1800", by F. A. Kirkpatrick; "The Errors of Macaulay in his Estimation of the Squires and Parsons of the Seventeenth Century", by the Rev. P. H. Ditchfield; "Some Correspondence between Queen Elizabeth and the Czars of Russia", by Madame Inna Lubimenko; "King's Scholars in History and Modern Languages at Oxford and Cambridge, 1724–1727", by Oscar Browning: "The Historical Side of the Old English Poem of Widsith", by Alfred Anscombe.

Leaflet no. 35 of the English Historical Association is *A Brief Bibliography of British Constitutional History.*

Students will heartily welcome the appearance of the first part (topographical) of the *Guide to the Reports on Collections of Manuscripts of Private Families, Corporations and Institutions in Great Britain and Ireland* issued by the Historical Manuscripts Commission through Wymans.

As one of the supplementary papers of the British Academy, the Oxford University Press issues *Roman Britain in 1913* (pp. 60, with 23 illustrations), by Professor F. Haverfield.

Among the announcements of the Cambridge University Press is a new edition of *Beowulf* by R. W. Chambers and *English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* by Miss F. E. Harmer.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc has written the introduction and narrative for *The Book of the Bayeux Tapestry,* presenting the complete work in a series of color facsimiles (Chatto and Windus, pp. xix, 76 plates).

The Clarendon Press is shortly to publish a collection of family charters and papers dating from 1232 to 1696, edited by Sir James Ramsay.

The second part of Professor Petit-Dutaillis's *Studies Supplementary to Stubbs's Constitutional History,* translated by W. T. Waugh and edited by Professor Tait, has recently been published by the Manchester University Press. This volume deals with the rising of 1381.

Miss Alice Greenwood is preparing a selection from the Paston Letters to be published by Messrs. Bell in *Bohn's Historical Library.*

Mr. G. P. Gooch has contributed to the *Home University Library* a study of *Political Thought in England: from Bacon to Locke* (Holt).

A work of some historical value, with a large accumulation of facts, is J. Wickham Legg's *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (Longmans and Company).

John and Sarah, Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, 1660–1744, based on Unpublished Letters and Documents at Blenheim Palace, by Stuart J. Reid (John Murray), finds its chief value as a study of the

Duchess of Marlborough, the new material bearing on the life of the duke being slight.

Berkeley and Percival (Cambridge University Press) by Benjamin Rand, consists of the correspondence of George Berkeley, afterward Bishop of Cloyne, and Sir John Percival, afterward Earl of Egmont.

Volume III. of *The Life of Lord Beaconsfield,* the first two volumes of which were written by M. F. Monypenny, has been completed by Mr. G. E. Buckle and will soon be published by John Murray.

Sir George Forrest, director of records to the government of India, is the author of *The Life of Lord Roberts, K. G., V. C.,* which was published but a short time before Lord Roberts's death.

G. Güttler has investigated the political theories and history of the labor movement in England in *Die Englische Arbeiterpartei* (Jena, Fischer, 1914, pp. x, 210). A local phase of the labor situation is the subject of *Londres et les Ouvriers de Londres* (Paris, Colin, 1914) by D. Pasquet.

The first series of the *Historical Records of Australia,* published by the Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, will contain governors' despatches and instructions to and from England. One large volume has recently been issued covering the period 1788–1796.

The *Victorian Historical Magazine* for June contains a chatty article on "Scraps of Early Melbourne History, 1835–1839", by Thomas O'Callaghan, and the continuation of Edward A. Petherick's "Bibliography of the State of Victoria"; by way of documentary material is published a report of June, 1837, on the proposed mail route from Yass to Port Phillip.

British government publications: *Calendar of Patent Rolls,* Henry VII., vol. I., 1485–1494, ed. J. G. Black and R. H. Brodie; *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth, January–June, 1583, and Addenda,* ed. A. J. Butler and Sophie C. Lomas; *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth, July, 1583–July, 1584,* ed. Sophie C. Lomas; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1 March–31 December 1678, with Addenda, 1674–1679,* ed. F. H. Blackburne Daniell; *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland,* third series, vol. VI., 1678–1680, ed. P. Hume Brown (Edinburgh, H. M. General Register House).

Other documentary publications: *Caithness and Sutherland Records,* vol. I., part VIII., 1422–1445 (29 Ashburnham Mansions, Chelsea); *Old-Lore Miscellany of Orkney, Shetland, Caithness, and Sutherland,* vol. VII., part IV. (*ibid.*); *Nottingham Records,* extracts from the archives of the corporation of Nottingham, vol. VI., 1702–1760.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Rösler, *Erziehung in England vor der Normannischen Eroberung* (Englische Studien, XLVIII. 1); H. L. Gray, *The Commutation of Villein Services in England before the Black Death* (English Historical Review, October); Lord Sheffield, *Les*

Relations Historiques Modernes entre l'Angleterre et l'Irlande (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII, 3); Charlotte Lady Blennerhasset, *Das Viktorianische England* [conclusion] (Deutsche Rundschau, August, September); E. Laskine, *Zur Geschichte des Sozialen Torysmus* (Archiv für die Geschichte der Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, V. 1); J. D. Mackie, *Scotland and the Spanish Armada* (Scottish Historical Review, October); G. Neilson, *Scotstarvet's "Trew Relation"*, IV. (*ibid.*).

FRANCE

General review: P. Courteault, *Bulletin du Sud-Ouest, 1911–1913* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

The *Correspondance du Maréchal de Vivonne relative à l'Expédition de Messine* is being edited by J. Cordey for the Society of the History of France. The documents in the first volume belong to the years 1674–1676 (Paris, Renouard, 1914, pp. 424). For the Society of Diplomatic History, L. Delavaud has edited a volume of *Documents du Marquis de Pomponne, Ambassadeur et Secrétaire d'État, 1618–1699* (Paris, Plon, 1911, pp. xx, 369) which was not actually published until last July. F. Scheichl is the author of *Der Malteserritter und Generalleutnant Jakob Bretel von Grémonville, der Gesandte Ludwigs des Vierzehnten am Wiener Hofe von 1664 bis 1673, der Mann mit der Schwarzen Maske* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914). R. Gleizes has written from contemporary documents *Jean le Vacher, Vicaire Apostolique et Consul de France à Tunis et à Alger, 1619–1683* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914, pp. xvi, 296).

In the edition of the works of Bossuet for the series of *Les Grands Écrivains de la France* (Paris, Hachette) which is being edited by C. Urbain and E. Levesque, the *Correspondance* has reached 1696 in the seventh volume, while the first volume of *Oeuvres Oratoires* covers the period 1648–1654. H. Brémond, *Bossuet* (Paris, Plon, 1914) in the *Bibliothèque Française, XVII^e Siècle,* contains a biographical sketch with selections from the works of Bossuet. *Bossuet et Louis XIV., 1662–1704* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. 128) is a brilliant essay by Professor A. Gazier.

The fifth series of *Paris sous Louis XV., Rapports des Inspecteurs de Police au Roi* (Paris, *Mercure de France,* 1914), by C. Piton, contains the notes and the index. P. Hildenfinger has brought out a volume of *Documents sur les Juifs à Paris au XVIII^e Siècle, Actes d'Inhumation et Scellés* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. viii, 290) for the Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Ile de France.

Professor Marcel Marion of the College of France has dealt with the years 1715–1789 in the first volume of *Histoire Financière de la France depuis 1715* (Paris, Rousseau, 1914). A volume on *Necker Économiste* (Paris, Rivière, 1914, pp. 316) is by C. Vacher de Lapouge.

A publication of the historical section of the general staff by Captain A. Latreille deals with the period from 1761 to 1789 under the title, *L'Armée et la Nation à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime, les Derniers Ministres de la Guerre de la Monarchie* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914, pp. xv, 460).

Professor H. E. Bourne is shortly publishing through the Century Company *The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Era,* a volume in the same series as Professor Hazen's *Europe since 1815* (edited by Professor Haskins).

As scarcely anything has been published describing the situation and feelings in the provinces at the moment of the assembling of the States General in 1789, there is peculiar interest attaching to the *Journal Historique de ce qui s'est passé en l'Hôtel de Ville de Rouen à l'Occasion des États Généraux du Royaume tenus à Versailles au Mois de Mai, 1789* (Rouen, Laine, 1914, pp. 46), edited by C. Poullain, from the manuscript in the municipal archives of Rouen. A discussion of *Les Origines de la Guerre de Vendée* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. viii, 282), by H. Jagot, appears as the tenth volume of the *Bibliothèque de la Révolution et de l'Empire.* E. Labadie has published numerous facsimiles in a little volume on *Les Billets de Confiance émis par les Caisses Patriotiques du Département de la Gironde, 1791–1793* (Bordeaux, Mollat, 1914, pp. 138); A. Leclère has issued the volume for 1790 in his exhaustive history of *La Révolution à Alençon* (Paris, Leroux, 1914, pp. xvii, 268). R. de la Giraudière has written a brief article on *Une Petite Commune Rurale de Sologne pendant la Révolution, 1792–1805* (Orléans, Gont, 1914, pp. 24); and there are volumes on *Thuret* (Riom, Jouvet, 1913, pp. 236) by J. Berriat-Saint-Prix, and on *Saint Ouen* (Paris, Champion, n. d., pp. 330) by H. Perradeau.

In a review of O. G. de Heidenstam, *Marie Antoinette, Fersen, et Barnave, leur Correspondance* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1913) by Professor Hans Glagau in *Internationale Monatsschrift,* VIII. 621–638, the authenticity of the letters, which purport to have been preserved by the Fersen family in the chateau of Löfstad, Sweden, is attacked. At the request of Heidenstam two Swedish librarians, C. M. Stenbock and Carl Grönblad, made an investigation and reported favorably to the authenticity in the June issue of the *Internationale Monatsschrift,* to which Professor Glagau replies at length in the same number, defending his original position and adducing new arguments to sustain his attack. Judgment must be suspended pending the presentation of indubitable proofs, which Heidenstam should lose no time in offering.

E. Welvert has edited from the notes and papers of Theodore de Lameth, the brother of the famous brothers Lameth of the Constituent Assembly and himself a member of the Legislative Assembly, a volume of *Mémoires,* and another of *Notes et Souvenirs* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1913, 1914). J. de Dampierre has edited *Mémoires de Barthélemy, 1768–1819*

(Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. xvi, 439); and G. Lacour-Gayet, *Mémoires du Vice-Amiral Baron Grivel, Révolution, Empire* (*ibid.*, pp. vii, 423).

Lieutenant Ducournau has dealt with the period of the Constituent Assembly in the first volume of *Le Pouvoir Législatif et l'Armée sous la Révolution* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1913, pp. 190). A volume on *Les Sociétés Populaires et l'Armée, 1791–1794* (Paris, Daragon, 1913, pp. 207) is by P. Dufay. The first series of Commandant G. Dumont, *Études sur l'Armée pendant la Révolution,* relates to *1791, Bataillons de Volontaires Nationaux, Cadres et Historiques* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1914, pp. 480). Captain S. Vialla has issued the first volume of *L'Armée Nationale: les Volontaires des Bouches-du-Rhône, 1791–1792* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914); Colonel E. Picard, *Au Service de la Nation, Lettres de Volontaires, 1792–1798* (Paris, Alcan, 1914); and R. Brice, a work of sober research on *La Femme et les Armées de la Révolution et de l'Empire, 1792–1815* (Paris, Ambert, 1914, pp. 363).

Bernadotte: the First Phase (*1763–1799*), by D. Plunkett Barton (John Murray) is an admirable study which the author hopes hereafter to supplement by a work on Bernadotte's later life.

The following recent publications relating to the Reign of Terror deserve to be enumerated: E. Seligman, *La Justice en France pendant la Révolution, 1791–1793* (Paris, Plon, 1913), continuing his earlier work; Abbé A. C. Sabatié, *Le Tribunal Révolutionnaire, Origine, Évolution, Principaux Procès, ses Victimes dans le Clergé* (Paris, Lethielleux, 1914, pp. xx, 640); E. Daudet, *De la Terreur au Consulat, Récits Romanesques et Tragiques en Marge des Temps Révolutionnaires* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914, pp. iii, 293); and G. Gautherot, *Le Vandalisme Jacobin, Destructions Administratives d'Archives, d'Objets d'Art, de Monuments Religieux à l'Époque Révolutionnaire, d'après des Documents Originaux en grande Partie inédits* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1914, pp. xv, 368).

Only very recently have the French undertaken to study their departmental administrative system and its history. The creation and organization of the departments in 1789–1790 and the vicissitudes and modifications of their administration under the Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration afford a wealth of good material which, in part, has been used in the following recent publications: G. Maurion, *La Formation du Département de la Seine-Inférieure* (Paris, Recueil Sirey, 1913, pp. 229); E. Couard, *L'Administration Départementale de Seine-et-Oise, 1790–1913* (Versailles, Aubert, 1913, pp. xi, 476); C. Faure, *Le Département de la Drôme de 1800 à 1802* (Valence, Céas, 1913, pp. 254); P. Viard, *L'Administration Préfectorale dans le Département de la Côte-d'Or sous le Consulat et le Premier Empire* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. 390); and Abbé J. Moulard, *Lettres inédites du Comte Camille de Tournon, Préfet de Rome, 1809–1814, Première Partie, la Politique et l'Esprit Public* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. xvi, 287); and *Le Comte Camille de Tournon, Préfet de la Gironde, 1815–1822* (*ibid.*, pp. xxxix, 586).

F. M. Kircheisen has issued the second and third volumes of *Napoleon I.; sein Leben und seine Zeit* (Munich, Müller, 1914), and his wife, Gertrude Kircheisen, the first volume of *Napoleon und die Seinen* (*ibid.*). C. Cherfils has written an essay on *Bonaparte et l'Islam* (Paris, Giard and Brière, 1913). P. Holzhausen, *Paris sous le Consulat* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914, pp. xi, 262), translated from the German by Commandant Minart, and Prince Charles de Clary et Aldringen, *Trois Mois à Paris lors du Mariage de l'Empereur Napoléon Ier et de l'Archiduchesse Marie Louise* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. xvi, 428), edited by Baron de Mitis and Count de Pimodan, give the views of foreign observers.

Col. Vachée's *Napoléon en Campagne,* mentioned heretofore in these pages, has been translated into English and published by the Macmillan Company under the title *Napoleon at Work.*

With the eighth volume the *Lettres et Documents pour servir à l'Histoire de Joachim Murat, 1767–1815* (Paris, Plon, 1914), edited by Prince Murat, have reached August 5, 1810. Some *Lettres de Dupont d'Herval, Chef d'État-Major de la Grande Armée* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914, pp. 154) have been published by A. Vaillant. Recent publications of memoirs by personages of the Napoleonic period include *Mémoires du Comte Roger de Damas, Vienne de 1806 à 1814* (2 vols., Paris, Plon, 1914), edited by J. Rambaud; *Mémoires du Général Bro, 1796–1844* (*ibid.*, pp. 314), edited by Baron Henry Bro de Comères; and Captain J. C. Friederich, *Mémoires d'un Mort, 1805–1828* (3 vols., Paris, Librairie Universelle, 1913). The third volume of General H. Bonnal's *Vie Militaire du Maréchal Ney* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914) has appeared. A. de La Valette Monbrun, *Essai de Biographie Historique et Psychologique, Maine de Biran, 1766–1824* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914, pp. viii, 544); J. Turquan, *La Générale Junot, Duchesse d'Abrantès, 1784–1838* (Paris, Tallandier, 1914); and Baron A. de Maricourt, *La Duchesse d'Orléans, la Mère de Louis Philippe, la Révolution, l'Exil, les Dernières Années* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914) are among the new biographies for the period.

Contemporary views of the July Monarchy and the Second Empire are furnished by E. Daudet's editions of the *Journal du Comte Rodolphe Apponyi, Attaché de l'Ambassade d'Autriche à Paris, 1826–1850* (vol. III., Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. 520), and of the *Journal de Victor de Balabine, Secrétaire de l'Ambassade de Russie à Paris de 1842 à 1852* (vol. I., Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914); and by Léon Molinos, *Quelques Souvenirs d'un Octogénaire* (Paris, Plon, 1914).

Correspondence with his wife and with most of the important contemporary statesmen of France appears in the *Lettres de Jules Ferry, 1846–1893* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1914). The presidency of Thiers is the subject of the second volume of A. Claveau, *Souvenirs Politiques et Parlementaires* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. iii, 474). A varied career in French affairs is revealed in Count de Maugny, *Cinquante Ans de Sou-*

venirs, 1859–1909 (*ibid.*). Jérome and Jean Tharaud describe another checkered career in *La Vie et la Mort de Paul Deroulède* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914, pp. 264). *Das Französische Geldwesen im Kriege, 1870–1878* (Strassburg, Trübner, 1913, pp. xii, 525) was presented by F. Gutmann, as his thesis for the doctorate at the University of Strassburg. A. Siegfried, *Tableau Politique de la France de l'Ouest sous la 3e République* (Paris, Alcan, 1914); A. Lods, *La Nouvelle Législation des Cultes Protestants en France, 1905–1913* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1914); and Professor Le Fur, *Le Protectorat de la France sur les Catholiques d'Orient et la Reprise de nos Relations avec le Saint-Siège* (Paris, Pedone, 1914) are other new publications relating to the Third Republic.

Some phases of the political agitation in France in the months preceding the present war are shown in L. Dimier, *L'Action Libérale dans les Élections* (Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1914, pp. 310); the second edition of G. Valois, *La Monarchie et la Classe Ouvrière* (*ibid.*, pp. clx, 400); and J. L. de Lanessan, former minister of marine, *La Crise de la République* (Paris, Alcan, 1914).

The militarist agitation in France during the months preceding the present war may be studied, in part, in L. de Montesquiou, *1870, les Causes Politiques du Désastre* (Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1914, pp. 288); C. Maurras, *Kiel et Tanger, 1895–1905; la République Française devant l'Europe, Nouvelle Édition revue et augmentée d'une Préface de 1905 à 1913* (*ibid.*, pp. cxviii, 433); which is a rejoinder to Marcel Sembat, *Faites un Roi, sinon Faites la Paix,* in reply to the first edition; C. Maurras, *Enquête sur la Monarchie* (*ibid.*, pp. lvi, 565); J. Bainville, *Le Coup d'Agadir et la Guerre d'Orient; Luttes et Conflits de la Triple Entente et de la Triplice, la Politique des Grandes Monarchies Autoritaires du XXe Siècle, Décadence du Libéralisme et l'Avenir de la Réaction dans l'Europe Contemporaine* (*ibid.*, pp. ix, 324); Colonel Debon, *Notre Parlementarisme et la Défense Nationale en 1914* (Paris, Figuière, 1914); and A. Mévil, *La Paix est Malade* (Paris, Plon, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. de Launay, *Le Combat de Perrigny, Août 52 av. C.* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); M. Tangl, *Die Epoche Pippins* (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für aeltere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXXIX. 2); J. Morize, *Aigues-Mortes au XIIIe Siècle* (Annales du Midi, July); L. Mirot, *L'Enlèvement du Dauphin et le Premier Conflit entre Jean sans Peur et Louis d'Orléans, Juillet-Octobre, 1405* [conclusion] (Revue des Questions Historiques, July, October); H. Prutz, *Die Briefe Jeanne d'Arcs* (Sitzungsberichte der K. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., 1914, 1); M. Sepet, *Observations Critiques sur l'Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc, la Relation Officielle du Procès de Condamnation et la Diplomatie de l'Angleterre* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); M. Prevost, *L'Assistance aux Invalides de la Guerre avant 1670* (*ibid.*); E. Divoff, *Paris pendant le Consulat,* I. (Revue de Paris, August 1); G. Labouchère,

Un Financier Diplomate au Siècle Dernier, Pierre-César Labouchère, 1772–1839 [conclusion] (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 1); L. Polier, *La France en Égypte* (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1); H. Welschinger, *Souvenirs de Bordeaux, 1871–1914*, I. (*ibid.*, November 1).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

In the *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, P. F. Kehr has issued the second part of the sixth volume of *Italia Pontificia* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1914, pp. xxxvii, 392) dealing with Piedmont and Liguria.

Various phases of the history of the Dark Ages in Italy are treated in G. Salvioli, *Storia Economica d'Italia nell' Alto Medio Evo, le Nostri Origini* (Naples, Detken and Rocholl, 1913); F. Tarducci, *L'Italia dalla Discesa di Alboino alla Morte di Agilulfo* (Città di Castello, Lapi, 1914); and G. H. Hörle, *Frühmittelalterliche Mönchs- und Klerikerbildung in Italien, Geistliche Bildungsideale vom 6. bis 9. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1914, pp. xii, 88) which deals with south Italy, Naples, Ravenna, and the Greek colony in Rome and shows the lingering of Greek speech and influence in Italy. The fifth part of L. Schiaparelli, *I Diplomi dei Re d'Italia* (Rome, Tip. del Senato, 1914, pp. 255) contains the diplomas of Hugh and Lothaire. The same editor has cooperated with F. Baldasseroni in the issue of the third volume of *Regesta di Camaldoli* (Rome, Loescher, 1914, pp. viii, 397).

A work entitled *Life and Letters of the Italian Renaissance* by Christopher Hare is announced by Messrs. Stanley Paul.

G. Jalla, *Storia della Riforma in Piemonte fino alla Morte di Emanuele Filiberto, 1517–1580* (Florence, Lib. Claudiana, 1914, pp. iv, 411); C. Contessa, *I Regni di Napoli e di Sicilia nelle Aspirazioni Italiane di Vittorio Amedeo II. di Savoia, 1700–1713* (Turin, Bocca, 1914, pp. 139); and C. Bandini, *Roma e la Nobiltà Romana nel Tramonto del Secolo XVIII.* (Città di Castello, Lapi, 1914, pp. xvi, 389) are recent monographs on modern Italian history.

In addition to A. Sartorius, Freiherr von Waltershausen, *Die Sizilianische Agrarverfassung und ihre Wandlungen, 1780–1912, eine Sozialpolitische und Wirtschaftliche Untersuchung* (Leipzig, Deichert, 1913, pp. xii, 385), the following monographs on the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods in Italy have recently appeared: P. Cardona, *La Sicilia durante la 1ª e 2ª Coalizione contro la Francia, 1793–1801* (Catania, Giannotta, 1914); A. Simioni, *La Congiura Giacobina del 1794 a Napoli* (Naples, Pierro, 1914, pp. 129); L. F. A. Peracca, *L'Alta Valle di Susa dal 1789 al 1804, la Rivoluzione Francese, la Repubblica Cisalpina, il Consolato di Napoleone* (Turin, Massaro, 1914, pp. 198); G. Rizzardo, *Il Patriarcato di Venezia durante il Regno Napoleonico, 1806–1814* (Venice, Ferrari, 1914, pp. 119); T. Baldi, *Un Episodio della Politica Ecclesiastica di Napoleone: a Proposito della Elezione del Vescovo di Nancy*

ad arcivescovo di Firenze, 1810–1814 (Florence, Seeber, 1914, pp. 129); and E. Piola-Caselli, *Un Ministro Toscano al Congresso di Vienna, 1814–1815* (Pistoia, Tip. Cooperativa, 1914, pp. 138).

The development of secret societies in Italy under the Restoration is shown in A. Baretta, *Le Società Segrete in Toscana, 1814–1824* (Turin, Unione, 1913, pp. viii, 175), and in Zara, *La Carboneria in Terra d'Otranto, 1820–1830* (Turin, Bocca, 1914). M. degli Alberti is using the papers of Count Bertone di Sambuy in the preparation of *La Politica Estera del Piemonte sotto Carlo Alberto* (*ibid.*, pp. 380), of which the first volume deals with the years 1835–1838. G. Leti has published a liberally illustrated volume on *La Rivoluzione e la Repubblica Romana, 1848–1849* (Milan, Vallardi, 1913, pp. xv, 531).

Messrs. Doran have published the third volume of their translation of the *Memoirs of Francesco Crispi,* covering the period of the formation and early history of the Triple Alliance.

During the past four years, Senator T. Palamenghi-Crispi has been publishing from the family papers a series of volumes of materials relating to the career of Francesco Crispi, under the following titles: *I Mille* (Milan, Treves, 1911, pp. 409); *Carteggi Politici inediti, 1860–1900* (Rome, 1912); *Politica Estera, Memorie e Documenti* (Milan, Treves, 1912), for the period 1876 to 1890; *Questioni Internazionali, Diario e Documenti* (ditto, pp. 300), supplementing the previous volume; *Ultimi Scritti e Discorsi Extraparlamentari, 1891–1901* (Rome, 1913), continuing *Scritti e Discorsi Politici, 1849–1890* (Rome, 1890; second ed., Turin, s. d.); and *La Prima Guerra d'Africa* (Milan, Treves, 1914, pp. xii, 419).

Italy's Foreign and Colonial Policy: a Selection from the Speeches delivered in the Italian Parliament by the Italian Foreign Affairs Minister Senator Tommaso Tittoni during his Six Years of Office (1903–1909), the English translation by Baron Bernardo Quaranta di San Severino (Smith, Elder, and Company), contains valuable material for any study of the diplomatic history of the years in question.

Isabella the Catholic, by Mrs. Julia Cartwright, has been added to the *Heroes of the Nations* series.

Two volumes of the writings of the second Viscount de Santarem, newly published for gratuitous distribution by the present viscount, have already been noted in this Review (XVIII. 656). A third volume, entitled *2º Visconde de Santarem: Ineditos* (*Miscellanea*) (Lisbon, Imprensa Libanio da Silva, 1914, pp. 583), contains a mass of historical, geographical, biographical, bibliographical, and archival information, largely relating to the history of Portuguese explorations and discoveries. Besides many brief notes the book also includes some memoirs, of which the longest is entitled "Vinda de parte da Familia Real Hespanhola para Portugal e suas consequencias" (pp. 1–62). The editor,

Jordão de Freitas, promises further volumes, with material for continuations of Santarem's *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Cosmographie pendant le Moyen Âge* and of his *Quadro Elementar.*

A. Pellizzari has collected a series of studies and essays mostly on Renaissance subjects in *Portogallo e Italia nel Secolo XVI.* (Naples, Perrella, 1914, pp. 338). B. Romano has issued a book on *L'Espulsione dei Jesuiti dal Portogallo* (Città di Castello, Lapi, 1914, pp. 125); and P. Lebesgue, on *La République Portugaise* (Paris, Sansot, 1914, pp. 307).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. H. Haskins, *Moses of Bergamo* (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXIII. 1); R. Palmarocchi, *Le Reforme di Gioacchino Murat nel Primo Anno di Regno* (Archivio Storico Italiano, LXXII. 1); F. Gentili, *La Relazione dell' Ambasceria di Mons. Morichini a Vienna nel 1848 e sua Genesi* (Rassegna Contemporanea, August 10); M. Mazziotti, *Lettere Politiche di un Intimo Amico del Conte di Cavour* (Nuova Antologia, October); P. Buscalione, *Cavour e la Massoneria* (Rassegna Contemporanea, July 25); Marquis J. N. Pepoli, *La Question Romaine, 1856–1860* [conclusion] (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 1, 2); Anonymous, *Le Pontificat de Pie X.* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15); G. A. di Cesarò, *Le Responsabilità del Marchese di S. Giuliano* (Rassegna Contemporanea, October 10); F. Mendizábal, *Investigaciones acerca del Origen, Historia, y Organización de la Real Chancillería de Valladolid, su Jurisdicción y Competencia,* I.–IV. (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, January, March, May, July); F. M. Angel, *La Vie Franciscaine en Espagne entre les Deux Couronnements de Charles-Quint ou le Premier Commissaire Général des Provinces Franciscaines des Indes Occidentales,* VI. (*ibid.,* July); M. Hume, *Las Reinas de la España Antigua, Juana la Loca, María Tudor, Isabel de la Paz* (*Isabel de Valois*) (La España Moderna, June–October); C. Cambronero, *La Reina Gobernadora, Crónicas Políticas de 1833 à 1840,* IV. (*ibid.,* October).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Two phases of Pan-Germanism are manifested and studied in C. Müller, *Altgermanische Meeresherrschaft* (Gotha, Perthes, 1914, pp. xii, 487), which treats the period prior to 1200, including the Scandinavian as well as the Teutonic peoples; and in A. Zimmermann, *Geschichte der Deutschen Kolonialpolitik* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914, pp. xvi, 336).

The fourth and fifth editions of the late R. Koser's *Geschichte Friedrichs des Grossen* have been concluded with a fourth volume (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1914, pp. 175) containing the appendixes, bibliography, and index. There is a biography of *Der Prinz von Preussen August Wilhelm als Politiker* (Berlin, Ebering, 1913); and one by B. Rosenmöller of *Schulenberg-Kehnert unter Friedrich den Grossen* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1914). The valuable manuscript of A. H. Lucanus, in the library of the University of Königsberg, describing *Preussens Uralter und Heutiger Zu-*

stand, 1748 (2 vols., Lötzen, Sommerfeldt, 1913, pp. viii, 16, 451; viii, 363) is a mine of historical, geographical, ethnographical, and statistical information collected by a judicial official under Frederick William I. and Frederick the Great. It deals with West Prussia as well as with East Prussia and will be consulted by students of Prussian history along with L. von Baczko, *Handbuch der Geschichte, Erdbeschreibung, und Statistik Prcussens* (Königsberg, 1802–1803).

The third volume concludes *Preussens Heer von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914, pp. xxv, 543) by O. Freiherr von der Osten-Sacken und von Rhein. The part relating to 1813 in *Das Preussische Heer der Befreiungskriege* (*ibid.*, pp. viii, 645) has been issued by the military history section of the German General Staff.

The year 1914 saw the publication of a notable group of works on the growth and spread of political ideas in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century. G. F. Preuss wrote on *Die Quellen des Nationalgeistes der Befreiungskriege* (Berlin, Mittler); P. Herre, on *Von Preussens Befreiungs- und Verfassungskampf, aus den Papieren des Oberburggrafen Magnus von Brünneck* (*ibid.*, pp. ix, 501); Meisner, on *Die Lehre vom Monarchischen Prinzip im Zeitalter der Restauration und des Deutschen Bundes* (Breslau, Marcus); A. Fichert, on *Montesquieus und Rousseaus Einfluss auf den Vormärzlichen Liberalismus Badens* (Leipzig, pp. viii, 112); and K. Buchheim, on *Die Stellung der Kölnischen Zeitung im Vormärzlichen Rheinischen Liberalismus* (Leipzig, Voigtländer, pp. xi, 430).

Several items relating to German historians of the nineteenth century possess an historical as well as a merely biographical interest. E. Waitz has written a *Lebens- und Charakterbild George Waitz, zu seinem Hundertjährigen Geburtstag* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1913, pp. 100); A. Lübbe, a monograph on *Friedrich von Gentz und Heinrich von Sybel: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913), and Rittinghaus, a study of *Die Kunst der Geschichtschreibung Heinrich von Treitschkes* (Leipzig, Voigtländer, 1914). Treitschke's *Briefe* are being edited by Max Cornicelius and published by Hirzel of Leipzig.

R. C. T. Eigenbrodt, *Meine Erinnerungen aus den Jahren 1848, 1849, und 1850* (Darmstadt, Staatsverlag, 1914, pp. iv, 58, 374) is a valuable detailed chronicle which was read in manuscript and annotated by Heinrich von Gagern. The editor, L. Bergsträsser, has written an excellent biographical introduction for this volume published in the *Quellen und Forschungen* for grand-ducal Hesse.

W. Schröder, *Handbuch der Sozialdemokratischen Parteitage von 1863 bis 1909* (Munich, Birk, 1914, pp. 591) presents in useful form a mass of material relating to the history of the social-democratic party. The first volume of W. Blos, *Denkwürdigkeiten eines Sozialdemokraten*

(*ibid.*, pp. vii, 287), is interesting though it gives but little new information.

Le Reichstag Impérial, 1871–1912; Étude de Démographie Politique (Paris, 1914) by Paul Meuriot; and *Die Deutsche Volkswirtschaft und ihre Wandlungen im letzten Vierteljahrhundert* (2 vols., Munich, Gladbach, 1914) by Georg Neuhaus are scholarly investigations.

Some of the conditions in medieval Frankfort are portrayed in K. Bücher, *Die Berufe der Stadt Frankfurt a. M. im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. 143) in the *Abhandlungen* of the Saxon Academy, and in I. Kracauer, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Juden von Frankfurt a. M., 1150–1400* (vol. I., Frankfort, Kauffmann, 1914). H. Dechent deals with a later period in his *Kirchengeschichte von Frankfurt a. M. seit der Reformation* (vol. I., Frankfort, Kesselring, 1914). The archaeological institute of Frankfort has published a volume of notable excellence and value by Georg Wolff on *Die Südliche Wetterau in Vor- und Frühgeschichtlicher Zeit* (Frankfort, Ravenstein, 1913, pp. 196) which relates to the environs of the city.

The commission for modern Austrian history has recently issued the third volume of L. Bittner, *Chronologisches Verzeichnis der Oesterreichischen Staatsverträge* (Vienna, Holzhausen, 1914).

Krauter's volume on *Franz Freiherr von Ottenfels* (Salzburg, Pustet, 1914) throws some light on the obscure subject of Metternich's policy and relations with the Greek war for independence. Ottenfels was ambassador at Constantinople during the period.

Messrs. Appleton are soon to issue *Francis Joseph and his Times* by Sir Horace Rumbold, who for four years was British ambassador in Vienna.

Hans Barth has begun the publication of a *Bibliographie der Schweizer Geschichte enthaltend die selbständig erschienenen Druckwerke zur Geschichte der Schweiz bis Ende 1912*, of which the first volume contains *Quellen und Bearbeitungen nach der Folge der Begebenheiten* (Basel, Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung, xviii, 529). The work is published in the *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte* of the Allgemeine Geschichtforschende Gesellschaft.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Krammer, *Die Frage des Laienkurrechts vom Interregnum bis zum Goldenen Bulle* (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für aeltere Deutsche Geschichtkunde, XXXIX. 2); A. Martin, *Geschichte der Tanzkrankheit in Deutschland* (Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde, XXIV. 2, 3); H. Barge, *Zur Genesis der Frühreformatorischen Vorgänge in Wittenberg* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 1); L. Bergstrasser, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Berliner Märztage* (*ibid.*); R. Fester, *Die Genesis der Emser Depesche* [conclusion] (Deutsche Rundschau, August); F. Mehring, *Engels und*

Marx (Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, V. 1); R. Peschke, *Moltke als Politiker* (Preussische Jahrbücher, October); P. Rohrback, *L'Évolution de l'Allemagne comme Puissance Mondiale* (Revue Politique Internationale, July); A. Dürrwaechter, *Zur Bayerischen Geschichte unter Ferdinand Maria und Max Emanuel* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXV. 3); A. Domanovsky, *Zur Frage der Thronfolge im Zeitalter der Arpáden* (Ungarische Rundschau, July); T. Ortvay, *Die Schlacht von Mohács; ihre Ursachen und Folgen* (*ibid.*).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

A. Oppermann is the editor of a new series of *Bijdragen van het Instituut voor Middeleeuwsche Geschiedenis der Rijks-Universiteit te Utrecht* of which the first volume is N. B. Tenhaeff, *Diplomatische Studien over Utrechtsche Oorkonden der X^e tot XII^e Eeuw* (Utrecht, Oosthoek, 1914); and the second, H. P. Coster, *De Kroniek van Johannes de Beka, haar Bronnen en haar Eerste Redactie* (*ibid.*, pp. 302). Beka was a Utrecht chronicler of the fourteenth century whose narrative extended from the time of Willibrod to 1346. The chronicle was first printed in 1611, and there is a continuation to 1524.

M. Joseph Cuvelier, general archivist of the kingdom of Belgium, began with the year 1914 the publication of an annual entitled *Les Archives de l'État en Belgique* (pp. 537). It was planned, and, as it will now seem, very fortunately planned, that the initial volume, for 1914, should contain not merely the year's reports of work and accessions, for the General Archives at Brussels and for each of the eight state archives in the provinces, but a tabular statement of the contents of each and of its printed inventories, the whole making a manual or guide of much value to the historical worker.

The *Bulletin* of the Belgian Commission Royale d'Histoire, LXXXIII. 1, consists almost entirely of a critical examination of the Anchin continuation of Sigebert of Gembloux (important for the years 1150–1200), by Dr. P. Kath. The Commission has also published *Les Archives Farnésiennes de Parme* (pp. 164), treated from the point of view of Belgian history, by Professor L. Van der Essen of Louvain, and the first part of M. Léo Verriest's *Les Archives Départementales du Nord à Lille* (pp. 181), from the same point of view.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Moullé, *Les Corporations Drapières de la Flandre au Moyen-Age*, I. (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); A. Eekhof, *Twee Documenten betreffende den Slavenhandel in de 17^e Eeuw* (Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, XI. 3); L. de Torre, *Los Motines Militares en Flandes*, I. (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, May, July).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The Autobiography of Charlotte Amélie, Princess of Aldenburg, translated by Mrs. Aubrey Le Blond (New York, McBride, Nast, and Company), the memoirs of a princess of the House of Trémoïlle, lady in waiting to the Queen of Denmark and wife to the king's brother, gives a useful picture of the customs of the period.

James Mavor, professor of political economy in the University of Toronto, has recently issued *An Economic History of Russia* (New York, Dutton, 1914, pp. xxxii, 614, xxii, 630). The first volume treats mainly of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the second of the revolutionary movements. The history of the Jews in Russia and their endeavors to improve their character and status are recounted in *The Haskalah Movement in Russia* (Philadelphia, the Jewish Publications Society of America, 1913, pp. 355) by Dr. J. S. Raisin.

E. A. Brayley Hodgetts is the author of *The Life of Catherine the Great of Russia* (Brentano), which attempts to treat Catherine chiefly from the point of view of her value to Russia. The author has achieved a fair-minded and detailed picture, using diplomatic papers and personal letters extensively.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Waliszewski, *Alexandre I^er^ Diplomate* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 3); E. Daniels, *Russische Finanzen unter Alexander II. und der Ursprung des Türkenkrieges von 1877* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); M. Kovalevsky, *La Contre-Révolution en Russie* (Revue Politique Internationalè, July, August); J. Dräseke, *Kaiser Kantakuzenos' Geschichtswerk* (Neue Jahrbücher, XXXIII. 7); F. van Langenhove, *La Nationalité Albanaise* (Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, February, March, June).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

The Archaeological Institute of America proposes to undertake the institution of an American School of Archaeology in Pekin. Preliminary inquiries and investigations in China, Indo-China, Manchuria, Mongolia, and Russia have been made by Mr. Langdon Warner, the director.

In *Japanese Government Documents, 1867–1889,* issued by the Asiatic Society of Japan (Tokyo, 1914, pp. 681) English translations are presented of all the essential documents—laws, constitutions, ordinances, rescripts—for the history of the transition from the feudal to the modern and representative régime.

The Arthur H. Clark Company has published a volume by Professor F. A. Golder, of the Washington State Agricultural College, on *Russian Expansion on the Pacific, 1641–1850,* an account of Russian expeditions along the Pacific Coast of Asia and North America, and to the Arctic regions.

In *The Gods of Northern Buddhism,* a sumptuous volume published by the Oxford University Press (pp. 246), Professor A. Getty presents an account of the history and progressive evolution of these deities throughout the northern Buddhist countries, and especially of their iconography.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. W. Rockhill, *Notes on the Relations and Trade of China with the Eastern Archipelago and the Coast of the Indian Ocean during the Fourteenth Century,* I. (T'oung Pao, XV.); M. von Brandt, *Zur Geschichte der Chinesischen Revolution,* II. (Deutsche Rundschau, September).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The work on the Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States which is being prepared by the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has profited much by the aid of Professor R. H. Whitbeck of the University of Wisconsin, who has been associated with it for the period extending from October 1 to February 1. Professor Golder has finished his work for the Department in the archives of Moscow as well as those of Petrograd, and is now on his way home.

The Naval History Society held its annual meeting in Washington on December 17. Rear-admiral Caspar F. Goodrich was elected president. The society has issued for 1914 the second volume of *Out-Letters of the Marine Committee,* ed. C. O. Paullin, and will soon have ready its books of Gustavus Conyngham and of Admiral Graves, the latter to be reinforced from the recently discovered papers of de Grasse. A book of naval songs and ballads is also in contemplation.

Teachers in secondary schools will find Dr. John Wayland's *How to Teach American History* (Macmillan), a storehouse of practical suggestions, useful bibliographies, and stimulating criticisms. With the concrete guides and lesson-plans of the usual manual for normal schools, the author has combined suggestive chapters on the philosophy which must underlie the teacher's work.

The *Magazine of History* for April, and the double issue for May–June, contain further installments of the late Colonel Legrand B. Cannon's "Personal Reminiscences of the Rebellion", and an interesting sketch in five parts by Professor Arthur K. Davis, entitled "Three Centuries of an Old Virginia Town (Petersburg)". We note especially, in the May–June number, an article by Charles W. Holmes comparing the British and American Cabinets and a somewhat important contribution by Edward E. Curtis entitled "The Provisioning of the British Troops in Boston, 1776". Among the documents are letters of Colonel Robert Gould Shaw, 1861, and single letters of Major Benjamin Church, 1696;

Washington, 1776; Martha Washington, 1793; Alexander Hamilton, 1800; Charles Pettit, 1780; Admiral Farragut, 1864; and General A. G. Draper, 1869.

Professor Edward A. Ross's *The Old World in the New: the Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People* (New York, Century Company, 1914, pp. 327) presents in collected form the author's articles in the *Century Magazine*, in which the amount and quality of the various elements in immigration to the United States are intelligently presented, with some data respecting the history of the movement.

Thomas Burgess has published a volume on the *Greeks in America* (Boston, Sherman, French, and Company, 1913, pp. xiv, 256) giving an account of their coming, progress, customs, living, and aspirations, with an historical introduction and the stories of some of the famous American Greeks.

Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1881 to 1910 (*Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*), by Samuel Joseph, is an examination of the causes of Jewish immigration and the most important social qualities of the immigrants.

The American Jewish Historical Society has signalized the completion of twenty years of publishing activity since its foundation in 1892, by bringing out an analytical index to the first twenty volumes of its publications. This *Index to the Publications* (the society, 1914, pp. viii, 600) is prepared in an admirable manner and furnishes a most complete guide to this valuable series. Appended is an index to the articles in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* relating to the history of the Jews in the United States.

The greater part of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society for June is devoted to a controversy over "The Air of the 'Star Spangled Banner'". In the same number as well as in the September issue, are further chapters of Griffin's "Life of Bishop Conwell, revised and edited by the Rev. Lemuel B. Morton". The latter number also contains an article by Robert J. J. Haskins on "The First Three Catholic Churches in Zanesville, Ohio", and extracts from the baptismal records of St. Mary's Church, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1795–1800.

Volume VII. (June, 1914) of the United States Catholic Historical Society's *Historical Records and Studies* includes the Sulpicians in the United States, by Dr. Charles G. Herbermann, Le Moyne D'Iberville, by Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, Pierre D'Ailly and the Discovery of America, by Canon Louis Salembier of the Catholic University of Lille, and Fra Junípero Serra and the California Missions, by Ann Judge.

An Economic Analysis of the Constitutional Restrictions upon Public Indebtedness in the United States (*Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, no. 637), by Dr. Horace Secrist, treats certain aspects of the sub-

ject historically. There is, for instance, a chapter upon the general environment which produced the constitutional restrictions upon state indebtedness, another upon the immediate causes, and a third upon the origin, of the constitutional restrictions upon municipal indebtedness.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The American-Scandinavian Foundation has just issued, in a projected series of Scandinavian monographs, volume I. of *The Voyages of the Norsemen to America,* by William Hovgaard, late commander in the royal Danish navy, now professor in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. While the whole problem of the voyages is investigated, their nautical aspects receive the most extensive treatment. Those parts of the Icelandic sagas that pertain to Vinland are given in translation.

S. de Ispizua has undertaken to assemble the available information on an obscure phase of the period of discovery in *Historia de los Vascos en el Descubrimiento, Conquista, y Civilización de América* (vol. I., Bilbao, Lerchundi Ledesma, 1914, pp. ix, 274).

The Hispanic Society of America has brought out *Willem Janszoon Blaeu, 1571–1638: a Sketch of his Life and Work, with special Reference to his large World Map of 1605,* by Professor E. L. Stevenson.

Mr. Artemas Ward of New York City has added to the collections in the Artemas Ward Homestead at Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, a full-size photoprint facsimile of the orderly-book of General Artemas Ward. The orderly-book extends from April 20, 1775, to March 20, 1777, and is followed by General Ward's letter-book, extending from April 7, 1776, to April 3, 1777.

The Yale University Press has recently published a revised edition of the *Life of Nathan Hale* by Professor Henry P. Johnston of the College of the City of New York. The first edition was published in 1901.

For this academic year, the Albert Shaw Lectures in American Diplomatic History at the Johns Hopkins University were given in November by Professor Clarence W. Alvord, the subject being the Partition of the West in 1783.

Professor Archer B. Hulbert has brought out through the Arthur H. Clark Company *Washington and the West: being George Washington's Diary of September, 1784; and a Commentary upon the same.*

The fourth volume of the *Writings of John Quincy Adams,* edited by Worthington C. Ford, has come from the press (Macmillan). The volume covers the years 1811–1813, when Mr. Adams was at St. Petersburg.

The Burton Historical Collection of the Detroit Public Library has come into possession of the orderly-books of Colonel Isaac Shelby, covering the period of the Detroit campaign in the War of 1812 under General Harrison.

The Neale Publishing Company has brought out *The Political and Economic Doctrines of John Marshall . . . and also his Letters, Speeches, and hitherto unpublished and uncollected Writings,* edited by J. E. Oster.

Mr. D. W. Howe, president of the Indiana Historical Society, has brought out through Messrs. Putnam a volume entitled *Political History of Secession to the Beginning of the American Civil War.*

The letter-press copy book of the correspondence of General W. T. Sherman during the two years prior to the Civil War, when he was in charge of the State Military Seminary of Louisiana, has been presented to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin by W. B. Carter of Lancaster.

Lieut.-Col. John Page Nicholson of Philadelphia has prepared and published in a volume of 1022 pages a catalogue of his collection of materials relating to the Civil War. The collection includes manuscripts and excerpts as well as books.

The True Ulysses S. Grant, by General Charles King, is the latest addition to Messrs. Lippincott's "True" series.

Dr. Annie Heloise Abel, professor of history in Goucher College, has completed her work on *The American Indian as Slaveholder and Secessionist: an Omitted Chapter in the Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy.* The book will be published soon. Miss Abel has edited for the United States Indian Office the official correspondence of James S. Calhoun, first territorial governor of New Mexico.

John Hay: Author and Statesman, by Professor Lorenzo Sears, has been published by Dodd, Mead, and Company.

Hon. Samuel W. McCall has written a *Life of Thomas B. Reed,* just published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

Little, Brown, and Company have brought out *Social Life in Old New England,* by Mary Caroline Crawford.

The Maine Historical Society has brought out four additional volumes of the *Documentary History of Maine* (XVII. to XX.), continuing the collection called the Baxter manuscripts, edited by James Phinney Baxter.

Dr. Henry S. Burrage, who was in England at the outbreak of the present European war, gathered for the Maine Historical Society an interesting collection of the posters used in connection with enlistments, etc., including the proclamations calling for troops and the war posters used by the city of Oxford.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at its semi-annual meeting of April, 1914 (pp. 215), is occupied to the extent of nearly five-sixths by a body of quite general Notes on the Calendar and the Almanac, by Mr. George E. Littlefield; and by a check-list of Con-

necticut Almanacs, 1709–1850, prepared by Mr. Albert C. Bates, secretary of the Connecticut Historical Society, with a suitable introduction and notes. The remaining pages contain an account of the early migrations of the Indians in New England and the Maritime Provinces, by Mr. R. B. Dixon, and a well-informed and clearly presented defense of Poinsett's career in Mexico, by Dr. Justin H. Smith.

The October serial of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society contains some papers, 1636–1644, of William Pynchon of Springfield, and a paper by Mr. Jonathan Smith on Toryism in Worcester County.

In the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* for October, the publication of Benjamin F. Browne's "Youthful Recollections of Salem", written in 1867, is continued, as are also the extracts from the probate records of Essex County, Massachusetts.

Rhode Island Imprints, 1727–1800, a collection of 1560 entries of books, pamphlets, newspapers, etc., printed in the colony and state during the eighteenth century, together with a number of facsimiles, is printed by the Rhode Island Historical Society for its members. The compiler is Mr. George Parker Winship, who also writes an introduction.

The report of the librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society, in the society's *Proceedings* for 1913–1914, notes among the accessions of the year a series of the *Newport Mercury* for 1774 and 1775 and a number of other early newspapers, the excessively rare *Calendrier Français,* printed at Newport in 1781 on the press of the French fleet, temporarily set up on shore, an extra-illustrated edition of Mason's *Newport,* comprising over 500 valuable documents, the gift of Mr. Oliver Hazard Perry, and the commissions and correspondence of Commodore Silas Talbot, consisting of about fifty manuscripts, including besides Talbot's official correspondence numerous letters from prominent persons to him. The manuscripts preserved in the society's vault have been catalogued, and the librarian has begun a check-list of eighteenth-century Rhode Island newspapers.

The *Annual Report* of the Connecticut Historical Society (May, 1914) includes a rough list of the Johnson family papers recently donated to the society. The more important of these are the papers of William Samuel Johnson, including nearly 500 letters written by him, about 200 letters written to him, and a series of letter-books extending from 1746 to 1774. There are numerous family papers of a miscellaneous sort. The society has received as a gift from Mr. James H. Goodwin 670 numbers of the *Connecticut Journal,* scattered through the period 1777–1821. It has also come into possession of the autograph collection of the late Edgar T. Welles, son of Gideon Welles, secretary of the navy in Lincoln's cabinet. The collection comprises about 2400 letters, principally of the period 1810–1860, many of them from men prominent in public and political life.

The Colonial History of Hartford, by Rev. W. De L. Love, is drawn from original records (Hartford, the author).

The fourteenth annual meeting of the New York State Historical Association, held at Saratoga Springs, Bennington, and Schuylerville September 17 to 20, 1912, was devoted to the several phases of the Burgoyne campaign. The numerous papers and addresses, as also some account of the sessions and other exercises, are brought out in volume XII. of the society's *Proceedings.* The principal of these papers are: Relation of the Battle of Bennington to the Battle of Saratoga, by Rev. Isaac Jennings; the Place of Saratoga in the Revolutionary War, by General A. S. Draper; General Schuyler's Part in the Burgoyne Campaign, by F. W. Halsey; General Daniel Morgan's Part in the Burgoyne Campaign, by Rev. J. H. Brandow; St. Leger's Invasion and the Battle of Oriskany, by F. H. Allen; and the Influence of the Death of Jane McCrea on the Burgoyne Campaign, by J. A. Holden. There is also a scholarly paper on Burgoyne by Rev. Henry Belcher, author of the *First Civil War in America.*

The sixteenth annual meeting of the same association was held in Utica, October 5 to 8. Among the addresses delivered the following may be mentioned: Notes on the Early History of the Palatines in the Valley, by Rev. W. W. Ellsworth; the Battle of Oriskany, by H. J. Cookinham; Early Institutions of Learning in the Mohawk Valley, by President Charles A. Richmond of Union College; the History of Transportation in the Mohawk Valley, by Lieutenant William G. Mayer; Samuel Kirkland and the Oneida Indians, by Rev. M. W. Stryker; and French Immigrants of the Black River Country, by W. A. Moore.

The *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* for July contains an account, by John Cox, jr., of the Quaker records in New York, together with a list of meetings and a map of 1821 showing the "Meetings constituting New York Yearly Meeting of Friends".

The *Acts and Proceedings* of the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies, ninth annual meeting, Harrisburg, January 15, 1914 (pp. 111), has been issued. Especially deserving attention are the report of the committee on the preservation of manuscript records and that of the committee on state legislation.

Among the recent acquisitions of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania are the following: a collection of Penn material, comprising William Penn's journals in Ireland, Holland, and Germany, documents relating to Pennsylvania affairs, and a number of letters of William Penn and others of the Penn family; the diary of Thomas F. Pleasants, 1814–1817, covering life at Camp DuPont; an addition to the Cox-Parrish-Wharton papers, including 152 manuscripts and nine maps, presented by Mrs. Rodman Wharton; an addition of 24 manuscripts to the Lincoln collection, from the estates of Louis C. Vanuxem and William Potter; fifty-nine maps and other materials, presented by Miss Letitia A. Humphreys

as an addition to the Humphreys collection; an addition of 217 letters and documents to the Dreer collection; and 119 miscellaneous newspapers published at Poughkeepsie, 1796–1825.

In the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for October Dr. John W. Jordan prints the Journal of John Watson, assistant surveyor to the commissioners of the province of Pennsylvania, 1750. Among the articles in the same issue is "The Pennsylvania and Virginia Boundary Controversy" by John L. Potter.

The Pennsylvania-German in the Settlement of Maryland, by D. W. Nead, illustrated by Julius F. Sachse, is part XXV. of the series of monographs prepared by authority of the Pennsylvania-German Society, having for the general title *Pennsylvania: the German Influence in its Settlement and Development.*

A new issue of the Rev. Jehu C. Clay's *Annals of the Swedes on the Delaware* (1835, 1858), has been brought out in handy form, but without substantial revision in the light of Dr. Amandus Johnson's researches, by the Swedish Historical Society of America (Chicago, the society, 1914, pp. 170).

The Maryland Historical Society has issued, for the state of Maryland, vol. XXXIV. of the *Maryland Archives,* embracing the proceedings and acts of the General Assembly from October, 1720, to October, 1723, five sessions.

Under the caption of "Some Old English Letters", the *Maryland Historical Magazine* for June prints a group of personal letters of 1724–1746, written by Mrs. Helen Wolseley Sprat, widow of the Bishop of Rochester, Mrs. Elizabeth Arnold Duncombe, Margaret Calvert, Bryan Fairfax, and Mrs. Alicia Arnold Ross. The letters are elaborately annotated by McHenry Howard. There are also printed a few documents on the Bank Riot of 1835, and further installments of the Vestry Proceedings of St. Ann's Parish, Annapolis; and of Land Notes, 1634–1655.

The *Colonial Trade of Maryland, 1689–1715,* by Miss Margaret Morriss, is a recent number of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.*

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for October contains the conclusion of the "Randolph Manuscript", continuations of the Council Papers (March–May, 1702), and of the Sainsbury Abstracts and De Jarnette Papers (October, 1677); and a group of eight letters from Richard Adams to Thomas Adams, 1771–1778.

The *Bulletin* of the Virginia State Library, vol. VII., nos. 2 and 3, consists of a list of maps relating to Virginia in the Virginia State Library and other departments of the commonwealth, together with the Virginia maps contained in seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century atlases possessed by the Library of Congress. Compiled by Mr. Earl G. Swem, and furnished with learned annotations, the pamphlet (pp. 37–263) forms a valuable work of historical reference.

The principal contribution in the *William and Mary College Quarterly* for October, is a study of "Morgan and his Riflemen", by Lieut. W. W. Edwards. Among the documents, apart from continuations, should be noted a "List of taxable articles . . . in Williamsburg . . . 1783".

The state of North Carolina has now brought out the fourth and concluding volume of Dr. Stephen B. Weeks's *Index to the Colonial and State Records of North Carolina.* Besides indexing with care the 26 volumes of the series, Dr. Weeks presents in his final volume an elaborate and authoritative "Historical Review of the Colonial and State Records of North Carolina", dealing with the history of this extensive publication and the character of its contents, and also furnishing a most useful description of the manuscript sources for the history of North Carolina in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in archives and libraries, domestic and foreign.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for July prints six letters of Peter Manigault written from London in 1750 and 1752, and the first installment of the parish register of St. James, Santee, 1758–1788.

The Tennessee Historical Society expects to issue this winter the first number of a *Tennessee Historical Magazine,* edited by Professor St. George L. Sioussat of Vanderbilt University.

The Ohio Valley Historical Association held its eighth annual meeting in Charleston, West Virginia, November 27 and 28. Some of the noteworthy papers presented at the meeting were the following: John Floyd and Oregon, by Professor C. H. Ambler; the Tories at Fort Pitt and what became of them, by Professor W. H. Siebert; General Wilkinson's First Break with the Spaniards, by Professor I. J. Cox; Early Land Grants in Southeastern Ohio, by Professor H. W. Elson; West Virginians *v.* West Virginia, 1861–1863, by Professor J. C. McGregor; and a series of papers on the development of transportation in Ohio.

The second number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* being the issue for September, marks in our judgment a distinct advance upon the first. Professor M. M. Quaife's paper called "Critical Evaluation of the Sources of Western History" examines once more the question of Jonathan Carver, but consists mainly in a dissection of George W. Ogden's *Letters from the West* (New Bedford, 1823), which is conclusively shown to be valueless. Of more importance are the articles of Professor W. H. Siebert on the Dispersion of the American Tories, that of Professor W. O. Scruggs on William Walker's Designs on Cuba, and that of Professor I. J. Cox on the Pan-American Policy of Jefferson and Wilkinson. Mr. D. E. Clark of the State Historical Society of Iowa surveys the historical activities of the last two years in the trans-Mississippi Northwest and in Western Canada. There are notes on Dr. Daniel Coxe's Carolana, on John Peter Salling's journey in the Mississippi Valley about 1738–1742,

on an additional petition of 1780 for a western state; also a diary of a scout who participated in the campaign for the relief of Detroit and Fort Wayne in August and September, 1812. Some forty books, of western history, of other American history, and of political science, are reviewed.

The *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for October is devoted to the proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the State Archaeological and Historical Society, and to the dedication in Columbus, on May 30, of the society's museum and library building.

The *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* for July–September contains the second installment of selections from the Follett Papers. The letters here printed are principally from Thomas Corwin to Oran Follett, and are of the years 1842–1851. Their principal interest lies in their bearing upon the history of the Whig party.

The *Indiana Magazine of History* contains an historical survey by Professor James A. Woodburn of Constitution Making in Indiana. Other articles are Jackson County prior to 1850, by John C. Lazenby, Indiana History in the Public Schools, by Oscar H. Williams, and the concluding part of Home Life in Early Indiana, by William F. Vogel.

The Indiana Centennial Celebration Committee has issued *Suggestive Plans for a Historical and Educational Celebration in Indiana, 1916.* The book is attractively illustrated.

Among the contents of the January and July numbers of the Illinois State Historical Society's *Journal,* we note the following: Marking the Site of Old Fort St. Joseph, by M. M. Quaife; The Great Cahokia Mound, by J. F. Snyder; The Early Courts of Chicago and Cook County, by Orrin N. Carter; New Jersey Families in Illinois, by Edmund J. James; and Soldiers of the American Revolution buried in Illinois, by Mrs. Edwin S. Walker.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1912 (*Publications* of the Illinois State Historical Library, no. 17) includes the papers read at the thirteenth annual meeting of the society in May of that year. Noteworthy among these are: the West and the War with Mexico, by W. E. Dodd; the Calumet Portage, by W. H. Lee; Genesis of the Whig Party in Illinois, by C. M. Thompson; Was there a French Fort at Chicago? by M. M. Quaife; Virginia Currency in the Illinois Country, by Mrs. Minnie G. Cook; and Senator Stephen A. Douglas and the Germans in 1854, by F. I. Herriott. Mr. W. D. Barge contributes a useful list of the old towns in Illinois, with their corresponding new names. *Publication* no. 18 of the library is *A List of the Genealogical Works in the Illinois State Historical Library,* compiled by Georgia L. Osborne.

The Development of Banking in Illinois, 1817–1863 (*University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences,* vol. II., no. 4), by Dr. George

William Dowrie, is a valuable contribution to the financial history of the United States. An interesting feature of the study is concerned with the relation between banking and internal improvements in Illinois.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has recently acquired, from the governor's office, all the papers therein preserved pertaining to the Civil War, numbering some 15,000 in all; a collection, numbering probably more than 40,000, of personal papers of the late Judge E. W. Keyes of Madison, covering the period from 1851 to 1910; and a small but interesting collection of correspondence between Edwin Bottomley, an early settler, and his father in England. The annual address before the society, October 22, was delivered by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Massachusetts Historical Society, on the subject of The Treaty of Ghent —and After. Besides the annual volume of *Proceedings* the society expects to issue soon the first volume of its *Calendar of the Draper Manuscripts.*

At a meeting of the executive council of the Minnesota Historical Society on November 10 Dr. Warren Upham, formerly secretary and librarian of the society, was elected archaeologist, and Dr. Solon J. Buck was elected superintendent and secretary. The society has recently acquired by gift from the library of Hon. Ignatius Donnelly a collection of letters, scrapbooks, pamphlets, etc., comprising about 30,000 items and relating principally to the history of Minnesota.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has published a *History of Township Government in Iowa,* by Dr. C. R. Aurner, which will later be followed by a *History of County Government in Iowa,* by Dr. F. H. Garver; also by a history of *Third Party Movements in Iowa,* by Professor F. E. Haynes. The society has also brought out volumes I. and II. of Mr. Aurner's *History of Education in Iowa,* which is to run to six volumes. Of the *Iowa Applied History* series, vol. II. is in press, reprints of the separate papers having already been issued, such as *Reorganization of State Government in Iowa,* by F. E. Horack, *Home Rule in Iowa,* by O. K. Patton, and *Direct Legislation in Iowa,* by Jacob Van der Zee. Of the *Iowa Social History* series, the latest project of the society, two volumes will be ready for distribution in the near future. They are: a *History of Social Legislation in Iowa,* by John E. Briggs, and a *History of Poor Relief Legislation in Iowa,* by John L. Gillin.

The October *Annals of Iowa* contains biographical sketches of Judge George G. Wright, John I. Blair, and Charles Abiathar White. There are also printed a war-time diary (May 15–July, 1864) of Dr. W. I. Nicholson, surgeon in the 29th Iowa Infantry, and a bibliographical contribution by Alice Marple, "Iowa Authors and their Work".

The principal contribution in the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for October is a careful study by Jacob Van der Zee of "Fur Trade Operations in the Eastern Iowa Country from 1800 to 1833". There is

also a suggestive article by Louis Pelzer on "The Public Domain as a Field for Historical Study".

A *History of Butler County, Iowa,* in two volumes, by I. H. Hart, and a *History of Franklin County, Iowa,* likewise in two volumes, edited by I. L. Stuart, are recent outputs of the S. J. Clarke Publishing Company.

The *Missouri Historical Review* for July presents Major Alphonso Wetmore's Diary of a Journey to Santa Fé, in 1828, edited by F. F. Stephens. The October number contains a study entitled "A Sketch of Missouri Constitutional History during the Territorial Period", by Floyd C. Shoemaker; and the translation of an account by Edward Zimmerman, a German immigrant, of a foot-tour in Missouri in 1838.

The Loan Office Experiment in Missouri, 1821–1836, by A. J. McCulloch, is issued as vol. XV., no. 24, of the *University of Missouri Bulletin.*

The *Fourth Biennial Report* of the board of curators of the Louisiana State Museum includes lists of the accessions to the department of history. Noteworthy are the Vidal papers and correspondence, 1787–1808, and papers of William Kenner and Company. The most important accession was the manuscripts, documents, etc., some ten thousand in number, dating from 1728 to 1803, deposited by the Louisiana Historical Society.

Aside from continuations, the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* for October contains an article on Harris County, Texas, 1822–1845, by Adele B. Looscan, and a letter from A. M. Manigault, written at Vera Cruz in 1847. The continuations consist of R. G. Cleland's Early Sentiment for the Annexation of California, Miss Sandbo's First Session of the Secession Convention in Texas, and British Correspondence concerning Texas, contributed by Professor E. D. Adams.

Mr. E. W. Winkler of the Texas State Library has brought out the *Diary of Ephraim Shelby Dodd,* December 4, 1862, to January 1, 1864 (Austin, E. L. Steck, pp. 32). Dodd was a member of Company D, Terry's Texas Rangers, and was hanged at Knoxville, Tennessee, as a spy, on the evidence of this diary.

T. Turnbull's Travels from the United States across the Plains to California, edited with introduction and notes by Professor Frederic L. Paxson, is issued as *Separate no. 158* from the *Proceedings* of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin for 1913 (pp. 151–225). Turnbull's journey west of the Missouri was by the Mormon Trail instead of the Oregon Trail, which was usually followed in 1852 by gold-seekers, and his journal is one of the few records of travel by that route.

The *Washington Historical Quarterly* for October prints an article by Professor F. J. Turner on "The West and American Ideals", and continues the publication of the Journal of John Work and of "A New Vancouver Journal", as well as of a syllabus of Northwestern history.

In its *Quarterly* for March, the Oregon Historical Society prints the annual address delivered before it by Judge William C. Brown: Old Fort Okanogan and the Okanogan Trail. The Journal of David Thompson, July 3–15, 1811, copied from the Ontario Archives, is printed with introduction and notes by T. C. Elliott.

California: an Intimate History, by Mrs. Gertrude Atherton, has been issued by Harper and Brothers.

Junípero Serra: the Man and his Work, by A. H. Fitch, is a popular account of the life of the Franciscan monk and pioneer (McClurg).

San Diego and Imperial Counties, California: a Record of Settlement, Organization, Progress, and Achievement (two volumes), edited by S. T. Black, is from the press of S. J. Clarke.

A revised edition of Professor Dean C. Worcester's *The Philippines Past and Present* contains a new chapter of nearly fifty pages reviewing "One Year of the New Era".

Dr. George Bryce has rewritten his *Short History of the Canadian People,* bringing the work up to date (Scribner).

Volume III. of Lescarbot's *History of New France,* edited by Professor W. L. Grant, has been issued by the Champlain Society.

Judge A. W. Savary has brought out a volume of 142 pages supplementary to Calnek's *History of the County of Annapolis, including Old Port Royal and Acadia,* edited and extended by him some years ago. The supplement corrects and enlarges the more important features of the older work and includes an account of the Scottish attempt at colonization under Sir William Alexander (1623–1632), and also of that under D'Aulnay de Charnisay, the first governor (1636–1651), besides much material concerning the Loyalist settlers.

The Fall of Canada: a Chapter in the History of the Seven Years' War, by Professor George M. Wrong of the University of Toronto, deals in detail with the events of a single year of the war, from Wolfe's victory before Quebec, in September, 1759, to the surrender of Canada in September, 1760 (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

We have received at the same time two pamphlets respecting the Rush-Bagot agreement and the history of action under it. The one, appearing in the pamphlet series of the World Peace Foundation, is *The Anglo-American Agreement of 1817 for Disarmament on the Great Lakes* (Boston, pp. 28) by Dr. Charles H. Levermore; the other, a publication of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, entitled *Limitation of Armament on the Great Lakes* (Washington, pp. 57), is a reprint of a report made to President Harrison in 1892 by John W. Foster, secretary of state, and originally printed as 52 Cong., 2 sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 9.*

The September issue of the *Revue Canadienne,* of Montreal, contains seven articles relating to Sir Georges-Étienne Cartier, the ministerial colleague of Sir John A. Macdonald, in commemoration of the centenary of his birth on September 6.

A brief sketch of *The Grange in Canada,* by H. Michel, is *Bulletin* no. 13 of the departments of history and political and economic science in Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

It is announced that Morang and Company of Toronto will issue a *Life of Lord Strathcona,* by Dr. John Macnaughton, of McGill University.

No. 9 of the *Canadian Archive Publications* is *The Canadian Northwest, its Early Development and Legislative Records,* vol. I., text by Professor E. H. Oliver, documents from the Minutes of the Red River Colony and the Northern Department of Rupert's Land, and six folded maps.

British Columbia from the Earliest Times to the Present, in four volumes, by E. O. S. Scholefield and F. W. Howay, comes from the press of S. J. Clarke.

Messrs. Putnam have issued *Mexican Archaeology: an Introduction to the Archaeology of the Mexican and Mayan Civilizations of Pre-Spanish America,* by T. A. Joyce.

M. Cuevas, of the Society of Jesus, has collected and annotated a volume of *Documentos Inéditos del Siglo XVI. para la Historia de México* (Mexico, Museo Nacional, 1914, pp. xxxi, 521). The first three books are included in the first volume of F. Cervantes de Salazar, *Crónica de Nueva España* (Madrid, Hausser and Menet, 1914, pp. lvi, 363), published in *Papeles de Nueva España,* compiled and published by Francisco del Paso y Troncoso.

Despite the lessening interest in the Mexican problem, due to European war, the output of books on Mexico has not altogether ceased. *A Popular History of Mexico,* by Hubert Howe Bancroft, is a book of 1887 by this veteran historian, brought down to date by the addition of a score of pages recounting the story of the present revolution (New York, The Bancroft Company, pp. 581).

Insurgent Mexico (Appleton), by John Reed, is a series of pen pictures of personal experiences and events among the revolutionists of Mexico, written by a newspaper correspondent. Phases of life both in the little armies and among the peons are set forth graphically and often humorously, and one gets some notion of the conglomerate of ideas and feelings underlying the revolution—and of Villa. At times, however, this rapid succession of moving pictures might be clearer to the understanding if more of explanatory legend were thrown upon the screen.

The Cuban *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* prints in the July–August number a group of letters from the correspondence of the intendant-

general of hacienda of Cuba with the Spanish government, July to October, 1747.

Smith and Elder have published in London, in two volumes, *The Spanish Dependencies in South America, an Introduction to the History of their Civilization,* by Professor Bernard Moses, formerly of the University of California.

Under the title *The Evolution of Brazil compared with that of Spanish and Anglo-Saxon America,* the Leland Stanford Junior University has brought out (*Publications, University Series*) a group of six lectures delivered at the university in the autumn of 1912 by Dr. Manoel de Oliveira Lima, sometime attaché of the Brazilian embassy in Washington, and author of numerous writings on Brazilian history. Professor P. A. Martin of the university furnishes an appreciative introduction and numerous explanatory notes.

The Uruguayan war for independence is the main subject of *Artigas y la Revolución Americana* (Paris, Ollendorff, 1914, pp. vii, 404) by H. D. Barbagelata.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. R. Swanton and R. B. Dixon, *Primitive American History* (American Anthropologist, July–September); Mrs. L. K. Mathews, *Benjamin Franklin's Plans for a Colonial Union, 1750–1775* (American Political Science Review, August); F. A. Woods, *The Racial Origin of Successful Americans* (Popular Science Monthly, April); M. Serrano y Sanz, *El Brigadier Jaime Wilkinson y sus Tratos con España para la Independencia del Kentucky, Años 1787 à 1797,* II., III. (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, May, July); G. Latorre, *La Separación del Virreinato de Nueva España de la Metrópoli,* I. (*ibid.,* July); Roscoe Pound, *The Place of Judge Story in the Making of American Law* (American Law Review, September–October); H. C. Washburn, *The Battle of Lake Champlain* (U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, September–October); L. N. Feipel, *The Wilkes Exploring Expedition* (*ibid.*); B. B. Kendrick, *Toombs and Stephens* (Political Science Quarterly, September); W. R. Thayer, *Lincoln and some Union Generals, from Unpublished Diaries of John Hay* (Harper's Monthly, December); A. R. H. Ransom, *Reminiscences of the Civil War* (Sewanee Review, November); Lieutenant W. J. Büttgenbach, *Coast Defense in the Civil War: Fort Sumter* (Journal of the United States Artillery Association, September–October); C. R. Fish, *Carl Schurz* (Political Science Quarterly, September); G. A. Wood, *The Black Code of Alabama* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); R. dè Manjarrés, *Proyectos Españoles de Canal Interoceánico* (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, January, March); G. Deschamps, *Jacques de Liniers, Libérateur de Buenos Aires* (Revue Sud-Américaine, July); A. L. Pereyra and L. de la Robla, *L'État des Provinces du Rio de la Plata en 1824 d'après les Envoyés du Gouvernement d'Espagne* (*ibid.*).

LIST OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN HISTORY NOW IN PROGRESS AT THE CHIEF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES, DECEMBER, 1914

[In 1897 the compiler of this list began the practice of collecting, from professors of American history having charge of candidates for the doctor's degree, lists of the subjects of their dissertations. These were then circulated among the professors, in typewritten form, to avoid duplication and for other purposes. Subsequently the list was enlarged to include all subjects, and not solely the American. In 1902 the practice began of printing the lists. That for December, 1909, was accompanied by a list of those historical dissertations which had been printed. The list for December, 1912, was printed in the *History Teacher's Magazine* for January, 1913; that for December, 1913, in this journal (XIX. 450–465). Henceforward, it may be expected that such lists will appear annually in the January number of this journal. Copies of the printed lists for the years 1909–1913 can still be supplied by the compiler, J. F. Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.]

GENERAL

E. P. Smith, A.B. Women's College of Baltimore 1904; A.M. Columbia 1909. History of the Opposition to the Theory of Evolution. *Columbia.*

ANCIENT HISTORY

S. G. Dunseath, A.B. Ursinus 1910; A.M. Columbia 1911. An Economic Interpretation of Hebrew History from the Egyptian Bondage to the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. *Columbia.*

George Dahl, A.B. Yale 1908, A.M. 1909. The History of the City of Dor, Syria. *Yale.*

W. B. Fleming, A.B. Muskingum 1894, A.M. 1897; B.D. Drew 1897. History of the City of Tyre. *Columbia.*

Carl Huth, A.B. Wisconsin 1904, A.M. 1905. Rights and Customs of Sanctuary in Ancient Greece and Rome. *Columbia.*

E. J. Jennings, A.B. St. Stephens College 1912. Some Aspects of Greek Society in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries. *Columbia.*

Oric Bates, A.B. Harvard 1905. The History of Cyrene. *Harvard.*

C. W. Blegen, A.B. Minnesota 1907; A.B. Yale 1908. Studies in the History of Ancient Corinth. *Yale.*

Herbert Wing, jr., A.B. Harvard 1909; A.M. Wisconsin 1911. The Financial Relations of Athens and her Allies in the Fifth Century. *Wisconsin.*

H. G. Teel, A.B. Dickinson 1911, A.M. 1912. Athenian Social Conditions represented in the Orations of Lysias. *Columbia.*

R. V. Cram, A.B. Harvard 1907, A.M. 1908. Studies in the History of Attic Demes. *Harvard.*

E. C. Hunsden, A.B. Columbia 1908. History of the Delphic Amphictyony. *Columbia.*

H. P. Arnold, A.B. Harvard 1906, A.M. 1907. Chronology of Delos, 314–166 B. C. *Harvard.*

A. D. Muir, A.B. McGill 1912. Ptolemy Philadelphus. *Harvard.*

F. W. Clark, A.B. Manitoba 1892; Ph.D. Chicago 1913. A Consideration of the Influence of Sea-Power upon the History of the Roman Republic. *Chicago.*

S. P. R. Chadwick, A.B. Harvard 1892, A.M. 1899. The Conditions of Italian Colonization during the Government of the Roman Senate. *Harvard.*

R. N. Blews, A.B. Greenville 1904. The Lex Julia Municipalis. *Cornell.*

W. E. Caldwell, A.B. Cornell 1910. Roman Society under the Julian and Claudian Principes. *Columbia.*

L. A. Lawson, A.B. Upsala College 1909; A.M. Columbia 1911. Social Conditions in the Principate of Augustus. *Columbia.*

E. D. Pierce, A.B. Vassar 1910, A.M. 1912. Asinius Pollio. *Columbia.*

J. J. van Nostrand, A.B. Chicago 1905; A.M. Leland Stanford 1911. The Administration of Spain under Augustus. *California.*

M. F. Lawton, A.B. Columbia 1904, A.M. 1913. Philanthropy in Rome and Italy under the Early Roman Empire. *Columbia.*

Margaret Bancroft, A.B. Wellesley 1912; A.M. Columbia 1913. The Popular Assemblies in the Municipalities of Spain and Gaul. *Columbia.*

Maud Hamilton, A.B. Cornell 1902. The Sources of Metal and Ore Supplies in the Roman Empire. *Wisconsin.*

R. P. Blake, A.B. California 1908; A.M. Harvard 1909. Imperial Legislation on Religious Matters during the Later Roman Empire. *Harvard.*

Dora Askowith, A.B. Barnard 1908; A.M. Columbia 1909. Documents on the History of the Jews during the Roman Empire. *Columbia.*

T. M. Dadson, A.B. McMaster 1906, A.M. 1909, Th.B. 1909. Persistence of Paganism in the Roman Empire. *Chicago.*

R. R. Powell, A.B. Rochester 1911. The Development in Roman and in English Law of Remedies against Fraud. *Columbia.*

P. B. Whitehead, A.B. Beloit 1906; M.A. Yale 1908, B.D. 1910. The Conversion of Pagan Buildings in the City of Rome into Christian Churches. *Harvard.*

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

C. H. Lyttle, A.B. Western Reserve 1907, A.M. 1908; B.D. Meadville 1910. Bar-Daisan of Edessa: his Influence upon the Doctrines of Mani the Persian. *Harvard.*

Dudley Tyng, A.B. Harvard 1902, A.M. 1904; B.D. Episcopal Theological School 1909. Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Harvard.*

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

T. P. Oakley, A.B. Columbia 1909. The Penitentials. *Columbia.*

T. C. Van Cleve, A.B. Missouri 1911. The Celtic Element in the Civilization of the Carolingian Empire. *Wisconsin.*

R. H. George, A.B. Amherst 1911; A.M. Harvard 1914. The Relations of England and Flanders, 1066–1215. *Harvard.*

Einar Joranson, A.B. Augustana 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1914. The Monastic Ideal of Service in the Twelfth Century. *Wisconsin.*

H. H. Maurer, A.B. Wisconsin 1907, A.M. 1909; Ph.D. Chicago 1914. Feudal Procedure in the Courts of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. *Chicago.*

A. C. Krey, A.B. Wisconsin 1907, A.M. 1908. The Latin Patriarchate in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. *Wisconsin.*

E. H. Byrne, Litt.B. Wisconsin 1903. Genoese Colonies in Syria, 1100–1300. *Wisconsin.*

M. R. Gutsch, A.B. Wisconsin 1908, A.M. 1909. Preparations for the Fourth Crusade. *Wisconsin.*

J. R. Knipfing, A.B. Cornell 1911. The Social Activities of the Franciscans in Western Europe during the Thirteenth Century. *Columbia.*

R. B. Yewdale, A.B. Wisconsin 1914. Life at Avignon under the Popes. *Wisconsin.*

R. A. Newhall, A.B. Minnesota 1910, A.M. 1911. The English in Normandy, 1417–1422. *Harvard.*

G. B. Hatfield, A.B. Oberlin 1908, S.T.B. 1908; S.T.M. Harvard 1914. The Influence of the Nominalistic Philosophy upon the Reformation Doctrine of the Church with especial Reference to the Period following the Council of Basel. *Harvard.*

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A. P. Evans, A.B. Cornell 1911. Religious Tolerance in the Age of the Reformation (1516–1530). *Cornell.*

Rudolph Kastanek, A.B. New York 1913. The Religious Policies of the House of Hapsburg in Bohemia from 1526 to 1781. *Columbia.*

N. A. Olsen, A.B. Luther 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1909. Trade Relations between England and the Scandinavian Countries from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century. *Harvard.*

C. L. Grose, A.B. Findlay 1910; A.M. Harvard 1914. Anglo-French Relations, 1672–1685. *Harvard.*

F. A. Middlebush, A.B., A.M., Michigan 1914. The Diplomatic Relations between England and Holland, 1678–1688. *Michigan.*

Frances Marion Fay, A.B. Radcliffe 1912, A.M. 1913. Trade Policy of England and France from 1689 to 1715. *Radcliffe.*

A. W. Nagler, S.T.B. Garrett Biblical Institute 1910; S.T.M. Harvard 1913. The Significance of Pietism in the Origin and Development of Methodism. *Harvard.*

Anne E. Burlingame, A.B. Syracuse 1900; A.M. Columbia 1910. The Anti-Slavery Movement in England and France in the Eighteenth Century. *Columbia.*

J. A. C. Mason, A.B. Toronto 1905. The Continental System and the Orders in Council. *Columbia.*

Margaret W. Piersol, A.B. Vassar 1912; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. Eng-

land and France in the Mediterranean during the Continental System. *Pennsylvania.*

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

A. J. Meyer, A.B. Rutgers 1900; A.M. New Brunswick Theological Seminary 1904. A History of the Observance of the Lord's Day, with Special Reference to Great Britain. *Columbia.*

W. O. Ault, A.B. Baker 1907; B.A. Oxford 1910. The Private Court in England. *Yale.*

J. E. Miller, A.B. Kansas 1910; A.M. Illinois 1913. Benefit of Clergy in England. *Illinois.*

C. A. Smith, A.B. Kansas 1908; A.M. Yale 1909. The English Liberty (Immunity). *Yale.*

James Kenny, A.B. Toronto 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1908. An Introduction to the Sources for the Early History of Ireland. *Columbia.*

A. H. Sweet, A.B. Bowdoin 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The Ecclesiastical Relations of the English Benedictines. *Cornell.*

J. L. Moore, A.B. Harvard 1914. The Lawmen and the Justiciar. *Harvard.*

E. S. Morris, A.B. Cornell 1914. The Royal Taxation of the Clergy in England. *Cornell.*

C. W. New, A.B. Toronto 1903; Th.B. McMaster 1906, D.B. 1907; Ph.D. Chicago 1913. History of the Alien Priories in England to the Confiscation of Henry V. *Chicago.*

C. W. David, B.A. Oxford 1911; A.M. Wisconsin 1912. Robert Courthose. *Harvard.*

H. H. Holt, B.A. Oxford 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1909. The Cost of Living in England, 1172–1183. *Wisconsin.*

H. A. Kellar, A.B. Chicago 1909. King John: the Interdict and Exchequer. *Wisconsin.*

Lyman Howes, A.B. Leland Stanford 1906; A.M. Columbia 1911. Educational Theories and Educational Influence of Roger Bacon. *Columbia.*

Carl Wittke, A.B. Ohio 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of Parliamentary Privilege. *Harvard.*

Frederic Schenck, A.B. Harvard 1909; Litt.B. Oxford 1912; A.M. Harvard 1914. The English Merchant Class in the Fourteenth Century. *Harvard.*

P. G. Mode, A.B. McMaster 1897, A.M. 1898, Th.B. 1899. The Influence of the Black Death on the Church in England. *Chicago.*

W. A. Gifford, A.B. Toronto 1904, B.D. 1909; S.T.M. Harvard 1914. The Lollard Element in the English Reformation. *Harvard.*

Elizabeth F. Jackson, A.B. Wellesley 1913; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. The Lord Lieutenant of the English County in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. *Pennsylvania.*

F. C. Dietz, A.B. Pennsylvania 1909; A.M. Harvard 1912. English Finances under the Tudors. *Harvard.*

Susan M. Lough, Ph.B. Chicago 1907, Ph.M. 1909. Administration of Ireland in the Time of Elizabeth. *Chicago.*

H. M. Wriston, A.B. Wesleyan 1911, A.M. 1912. The English Monarchomachs. *Harvard.*

T. R. Galbraith, B.S. Pennsylvania 1897. The First Five Years of the British East India Company. *Pennsylvania.*

J. E. Gillespie, A.B. Cornell 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Influence of Oversea Expansion on England to 1700. *Columbia.*

R. B. Westerfield, A.B. Ohio Northern University 1907, A.M. 1910; A.M. Yale 1911. The Mercantile Organization in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. *Yale.*

F. W. Pitman, Ph.B. Yale 1904, A.M. 1906. The History of the Sugar Industry in the British Empire in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. *Yale.*

A. J. Klein, A.B. Wabash 1906; B.D. Union Theological Seminary 1909; A.M. Columbia 1909. The Sources for Tolerance in England during the Reign of James I. *Columbia.*

Mabelle Louise Moses, A.B. Leland Stanford 1899; A.M. Radcliffe 1908. The Economic Policy of Charles I. and the Commonwealth. *Radcliffe.*

T. C. Pease, Ph.B. Chicago 1907, Ph.D. 1914. John Lilburn and the Levellers. *Chicago.*

A. C. Dudley, Princeton Theological Seminary 1907. The Clarendon Code in England, 1660–1689. *Johns Hopkins.*

P. C. Galpin, A.B. Yale 1910, A.M. 1912. The Rise of Political Nonconformity in England after 1660. *Yale.*

G. F. Zook, A.B. Kansas 1906, A.M. 1907. The Royal African Company, 1662–1715. *Cornell.*

E. B. Russell, Ph.B. Vermont 1906. Action of the Privy Council on Colonial Legislation. *Columbia.*

W. T. Morgan, A.B. Ohio 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Whig Party, 1700–1720. *Yale.*

O. H. Draper, A.B. Johns Hopkins 1910; B.D. Drew 1912. Ecclesiastical Politics under James II. *Columbia.*

Alden Anderson, A.B. Bethany 1910. British Trade in the Baltic in the Eighteenth Century. *Yale.*

J. R. H. Moore, A.B. Boston 1899, A.M. 1906. The English Colonial System under the Hanoverians. *Harvard.*

Mary G. Young, A.B. Cornell 1898, A.M. 1908. The Organization of the Whig Party under Sir Robert Walpole. *Yale.*

Judith B. Williams, A.B. Vassar 1912; A.M. Columbia 1913. An Introduction to the Literature and Sources for the English Industrial Revolution. *Columbia.*

L. S. Mayo, A.B. Harvard 1910, A.M. 1911. The Political and Military Career of Jeffrey Amherst. *Harvard.*

N. Macdonald, A.B. Queen's (Kingston) 1913. Henry Dundas, first Lord Melville (1742–1811). *Cornell.*

F. F. Rosenblatt, A.B. Columbia 1907, A.M. 1908. History of the Chartist Movement. *Columbia.*

FRANCE

N. S. Parker, A.B. Chicago 1911; A.M. Harvard 1912. Trade Routes in Southern France in the Middle Ages. *Chicago.*

C. G. Kelly, A.B. Johns Hopkins 1908. French Protestantism on the Eve of the Religious Wars, 1559–1562. *Johns Hopkins.*

J. S. Will, A.B. Toronto 1897. The Persecution of the Huguenots in France under Louis XIV. *Columbia.*

L. B. Packard, A.B. Harvard 1909. Economic Aspects of the French Royal Policy, 1700–1756. *Harvard.*

M. P. Cushing, A.B. Bowdoin 1909; A.M. Columbia 1912. Baron d'Holbach. *Columbia.*

C. O. Hardy, A.B. Ottawa 1904. The Race Question during the French Revolution. *Chicago.*

Eloise Ellery, A.B. Vassar 1897. Brissot de Warville. *Cornell.*

W. A. Frayer, A.B. Cornell 1903. Marat. *Cornell.*

A. L. Barton, A.B. Chicago 1900. Marat's Opinion of the Men of the French Revolution. *Cornell.*

Ellen H. Adams, A.B. Cornell 1913. Billaud-Varenne in the French Revolution. *Cornell.*

F. L. Nussbaum, A.B. Cornell 1906. Ducher: an Exponent of the American Influence in the French Revolution, with particular reference to Commercial Legislation. *Pennsylvania.*

P. W. MacDonald, A.B. Wisconsin 1910, A.M. 1911. A Study of the Committee of Public Safety during the Reign of Terror, with regard to its Centralizing Policy and its Relations to the Local Authorities. *Wisconsin.*

Lucy Lewis, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1893. The Continental System and French Industry. *Pennsylvania.*

E. P. Brush, A.B. Smith 1909; A.M. Illinois 1912. François Pierre Guillaume Guizot, the Historian. *Illinois.*

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

A. F. Peine, A.B. Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Illinois 1913. Cola di Rienzi and the Popular Revival of the Empire. *Illinois.*

Keith Vosburg, A.B. California 1910; A.B. Oxford 1913. Milan under the Visconti. *Harvard.*

Gertrude B. Richards, A.B. Cape Girardeau 1909; A.M. Wellesley 1910. The Younger Pico della Mirandola. *Cornell.*

D. F. Grass, Ph.B. Iowa College 1894; A.B. Harvard 1898, A.M. 1899. Antonio Serra's *Breve Trattato*: the Beginning of Political Economy in Italy. *Leland Stanford.*

Julius Klein, Litt.B. California 1907, Litt.M. 1908. The *Mesta*: a Study in Spanish Economic History, 1273–1835. *Harvard.*

J. G. McDonald, A.B. Indiana 1909, A.M. 1910. The Spanish *Corregidor*: Origin and Development. *Harvard.*

C. E. McGuire, A.B. Harvard 1911, A.M. 1912. The Right of Asylum in the Middle Ages, with special Reference to Spain. *Harvard.*

A. Neuman, B.S. Columbia 1909, A.M. 1912. Jewish Communal Life in Spain during the Thirteenth Century. *Columbia.*

C. H. Haring, A.B. 1907; Litt.B. Oxford 1909. Trade and Navigation between Spain and the Indies during the Reign of Charles V. *Harvard.*

F. E. J. Wilde, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. The Career of Don Antonio of Portugal. *Pennsylvania.*

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

K. R. Greenfield, A.B. Western Maryland 1911. Paternal Government in Medieval Cities of the Lower Rhine. *Johns Hopkins.*

Helen Boyce, Ed.B. Chicago 1905. The Duchy of Brunswick under Henry the Younger (1517–1568) and his Son Julius (1568–1589): an Economic Study. *Chicago.*

Mabel E. Hodder, A.B. Syracuse 1895; A.M. Minnesota 1900; Radcliffe 1904. Peter Binsfeld and Cornelius Loos: an Episode in the History of Witchcraft. *Cornell.*

F. C. Church, A.B. Cornell 1909. Boniface Amerbach and his Circle. *Cornell.*

C. F. Lemke, A.B. Wisconsin 1903. The Opposition to Stein's Reforms in Prussia. *Chicago.*

D. O. Clark, A.B. Drury 1890; A.M. Illinois 1909. Stein's Principles of Administration. *Illinois.*

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

Paul Fox, A.B. Western Reserve 1906, A.M. 1908; B.D. Oberlin 1907. Phases in the Social and Economic History of Poland. *Johns Hopkins.*

Alexander Baltzly, A.B. Harvard 1912, A.M. 1913. Russia's Entry into European Politics: Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich in the Great Northern War. *Harvard.*

Cleanthes Vassardakis, LL.D. National University of Athens 1910; S.D. University of Geneva 1908. The Bank of Greece. *Chicago.*

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

J. K. Wright, A.B. Harvard 1913; A.M. 1914. A Study of European Knowledge of the Far East in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. *Harvard.*

C. H. Cunningham, B.L. California 1909, M.L. 1910. The Audiencia in the Philippine Islands. *California.*

William L. Schurz, B.L. California 1911; M.L. 1912. The Manila Galleon. *California.*

K. C. Leebrick, S.B. California, 1911; S.M. 1913. The English Expedition to Manila in 1762, and the Government of the Philippine Islands by the East India Company. *California.*

S. Kitasawa, A.B. Waseda 1910; A.M. North Carolina 1911. History and Growth of National Indebtedness in Japan. *Johns Hopkins.*

P. L. Gillette, A.B. Colorado College 1897; A.M. Yale 1909. The History of Corean Gilds. *Yale.*

H. L. Reed, A.B. Oberlin 1911. The Currency Policy of India since 1898. *Cornell.*

L. H. Davis, B.S. Pennsylvania 1901, LL.B. 1904, A.M. 1912. The Doctrine of Spheres of Influence and the Open-Door Policy in China. *Pennsylvania.*

AMERICA: GENERAL

H. H. Holmes, Ph.B. Alabama Normal 1904. History of the Denominational Control of Education in the United States. *Columbia.*

Carrie M. Lewis, A.B. Cornell 1903. A History of the Literature of Abolition. *Cornell.*

L. E. Crossman, A.B. Michigan 1913, A.M. 1914. Literary Campaign against Abolition. *Michigan.*

W. E. Rich, A.B. Wesleyan 1911, A.M. 1912. The History of the Post Office in the United States. *Harvard.*

Lucia von Lueck Becker, Ph.B. Chicago 1909, Ph.M. 1911. The History of the Admission of New States into the Union. *Chicago.*

A. H. Buffington, A.B. Williams 1907; A.M. Harvard 1909. The Spirit of Expansion in the United States prior to 1860. *Harvard.*

J. L. Goebel, jr., A.B. Illinois 1912, A.M. 1913. Recognition of De Facto Governments by the United States. *Illinois.*

K. W. Colgrove, A.B. Iowa 1909, A.M. 1910. The Early History of State Instructions to Senators and Representatives in Congress. *Harvard.*

A. P. James, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1906; B.A. Oxford 1910; A.M. Chicago 1912. The Constitutional Responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury. *Chicago.*

Q. Wright, A.B. Lombard 1912; A.M. Illinois 1913. The Extent to which the Principles of International Law have been Incorporated in the Municipal Law of the United States. *Illinois.*

Ralston Hayden, A.B. Knox 1910; A.M. Michigan 1911. The Treaty-making Power of the United States Senate. *Michigan.*

T. P. Martin, A.B. Leland Stanford 1913; A.M. California 1914. The Confirmation of Foreign Land Titles in the Acquired Territories of the United States. *Harvard.*

C. H. Crennan, A.B. Indiana 1913, A.M. 1914. The American State Executive. *Pennsylvania.*

A. W. Lovell, A.B. Dartmouth 1903; LL.B. Boston 1907, LL.M. 1907. The History of the Office of Attorney-General in the United States. *Yale.*

E. C. Evans, A.B. Missouri 1910, A.M. 1912. The History of the Australian Ballot System in the United States. *Chicago.*

A. C. Henry, A.B. Franklin and Marshall 1910. The Influence of the United States in the Movement for International Arbitration and Peace. *Pennsylvania.*

O. C. Ault, A.B. Tri-State 1907; A.B. Defiance 1911. The Recent Development of Socialism in the United States. *Chicago.*

AMERICA: GENERAL, ECONOMIC

Mary J. Lanier, S.B. Chicago 1909. Geographical Influence on the Development of Atlantic Seaports. *Chicago.*

R. M. Tryon, A.B. Indiana 1907, A.M. 1912. Household Manufactures in the United States, 1640–1860. *Chicago.*

H. A. Wooster, A.B. Wesleyan 1909, A.M. 1910. The Rise of a Wage-Earning Class in the United States. *Yale.*

F. E. Richter, A.B. Harvard 1913. The History of the Copper Industry in the United States. *Harvard.*

L. M. Crosgrave, A.B. Indiana 1909; A.M. Harvard 1911. The History of the Glass Industry in the United States. *Harvard.*

A. H. Cole, A.B. Bowdoin 1911; A.M. Harvard 1913. The History of the Woollen Manufacturing Industry in the United States. *Harvard.*

C. K. Knight, A.B. Ohio 1912, A.M. 1913. The History of Life Insurance in the United States. *Illinois.*

E. H. Hahne, A.B. Nebraska 1911, LL.B. 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of the Meat Packing Industry in the United States. *Harvard.*

J. Anton De Hass, A.B. Leland Stanford 1910; A.M. Harvard 1911. History of the Wage Theories of American Economists. *Leland Stanford.*

W. L. Abbott, A.B. Pennsylvania 1911, A.M. 1913, LL.B. 1913. Development of the Theory of the Tariff in the United States. *Pennsylvania.*

D. S. Hanchett, A.B. Wisconsin 1910. History of the Commercial Policy of the United States. *Pennsylvania.*

T. F. Leilich, A.B. Washington (St. Louis) 1912. A History of Railroad Capitalization in the United States. *Cornell.*

F. H. Gilman, A.B. Wesleyan 1909; A.M. Cornell 1910. Federal Supervision of Banks. *Cornell.*

F. L. Cummings, A.B. Chicago 1904, A.M. 1911. The Development of Prairie Agriculture. *Chicago.*

AMERICA: IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

G. A. Washburne, A.B. Ohio State 1907; A.M. Columbia 1913. Imperial Control over the Administration of Justice in the American Colonies. *Columbia.*

J. P. Gillespie, A.B. Columbia 1905; B.D. Union Theological Seminary 1907. The Influence of Religious Ideas on American Colonial Life. *Columbia.*

James R. Young, A.B. Leland Stanford 1909, A.M. 1910. The Relation

of Church and Clergy to Education in the Thirteen American Colonies. *Chicago.*

A. A. Holtz, A.B. Colgate 1909; Ph.M. Chicago 1910, D.B. 1911, Ph.D. 1914. The Moral and Religious Element in American Education to 1800. *Chicago.*

Hubert Phillips, A.B. Chattanooga 1908; A.M. Columbia 1913. The Development of the Residential Qualification on Suffrage in the American Colonies. *Columbia.*

V. W. Crane, A.B. Michigan 1911; A.M. Harvard 1912. The Southern Frontier of the English Colonies in America, 1670–1763: Relations with the Indians, French, and Spanish. *Pennsylvania.*

Charles J. Faust, A.B. North Dakota 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1912. The Relation of the Southern Colonies to the Indians before the Revolution. *Chicago.*

A. P. Scott, A.B. Princeton 1904; B.D. Chicago Theological Seminary 1910. A Comparative Study of the Criminal Legislation of Massachusetts and Virginia in Colonial Times. *Chicago.*

H. J. Coppock, A.B. Earlham 1904, A.M. 1908. Immigration into the American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century. *Columbia.*

W. W. Kemp, A.B. Leland Stanford 1898. Educational Work in the American Colonies of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701–1783. *Columbia.*

C. H. Maxson, A.B. Rochester 1892, A.M. 1895. The Great Awakening. *Chicago.*

R. V. Harlow, A.B. Yale 1909, A.M. 1911. The History of Legislative Committees, 1750–1800. *Yale.*

Louise F. Perring, B.S. Temple 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1912. The Policy of Imperial Defense in the Southern Colonies during the French and Indian War. *Pennsylvania.*

J. A. Hofto, A.B. North Dakota 1913, A.M. 1914. John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department. *Illinois.*

A. H. Basye, A.B. Kansas 1904, A.M. 1906. The Office of Secretary of State for America. *Yale.*

C. D. Johns, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1908; A.M. Chicago 1911. The Southern Loyalists. *Chicago.*

E. E. Curtis, A.B. Yale 1910. The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution. *Yale.*

Leita M. Davis, A.B. Michigan 1911. Proposals to Amend the Articles of Confederation. *Pennsylvania.*

L. H. Gipson, A.B. Idaho 1903; B.A. Oxford 1907. Jared Ingersoll. *Chicago.*

A. M. Schlesinger, A.B. Ohio State 1910; A.M. Columbia 1911. The Association of the First Congress. *Columbia.*

J. L. Deming, A.B. Cincinnati 1899; A.M. Bethany 1900. Immigration to the United States, 1776–1820: a Study in Causes and Effects. *Columbia.*

Vernon Stauffer, A.B. Hiram 1901. Illuminism in America. *Columbia.*

C. E. Sweitzer, A.B. Johns Hopkins 1908; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. The Influence of John Jay in American Diplomacy. *Pennsylvania.*

Orpha E. Leavitt, A. B. English Policy towards the United States, 1783–1795. *Wisconsin.*

A. L. Kohlmeier, A.B. Indiana 1908; A.M. Harvard 1911. Commerce between the United States and the Dutch from 1783 to 1789. *Harvard.*

Jane M. Berry, Ph.B. Chicago 1904; A.M. Columbia 1913. Relations between the United States and Spain in the Southwest between 1793 and 1795. *Chicago.*

W. A. Robinson, A.B. Bowdoin 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1910. The Republican Party in New England, 1793–1815. *Yale.*

S. F. Bemis, A.B. Clark College 1912; A.M. Clark University 1913. The History and Diplomacy of the Jay Treaty. *Harvard.*

D. R. Anderson, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1900, A.M. 1901; Ph.D. Chicago 1912. William Branch Giles: a Biography. *Chicago.*

Catherine C. Cleveland, Litt.B. Wisconsin 1894; Ph.D. Chicago 1914. The Great Revival in the West, 1797–1805. *Chicago.*

Peter Hoekstra, A.B. Michigan 1910, A.M. 1911. The Relations between the United States and the Netherlands, 1803–1840. *Pennsylvania.*

Anna C. Clauder, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1905. The Napoleonic Wars as Reflected on the Commerce to Philadelphia and New York from 1806 to 1812. *Pennsylvania.*

H. C. Hockett, A.B. Wisconsin 1903. Political Parties in the United States from 1815 to 1825. *Wisconsin.*

P. L. White, A.B. Bowdoin 1914. The Relations between France and the United States, 1815–1848. *Pennsylvania.*

R. W. Neeser, A.B. Yale 1906, A.M. 1909. Operations of the American Navy on the Coast of Africa in Connection with the Suppression of the Slave Trade. *Yale.*

T. N. Hoover, A.B. Ohio 1905, A.M. 1906; A.M. Harvard 1907. The Monroe Doctrine. *Harvard.*

R. T. Hearon, A.B. George Peabody College 1906; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. The American Free-Trade Movement, 1824–1860. *Wisconsin.*

D. C. Orbison, Litt.B. Princeton 1912. American Diplomatic Relations with Russia since 1824. *Pennsylvania.*

Florence Robinson, A.M. Wisconsin 1892. Social Movements, 1825–1860. *Wisconsin.*

Marie P. Dickoré, A.B. Cincinnati 1907, A.M. 1908. The Public Land System in the Thirties. *Wisconsin.*

A. E. Martin, A.B. William Jewell 1908, A.M. 1912. The Anti-Slavery Movement in the Southwest before 1840. *Cornell.*

E. E. Robinson, A.B. Wisconsin 1908, A.M. 1910. Political Grouping, 1832–1840: the Rise of the Whig Party. *Wisconsin.*

G. H. Barnes, A.B. Michigan 1912, A.M. 1913. The Abolitionists and

the Slavery Issue as Illustrated by the Struggle for Right of Petition in Congress. *Pennsylvania.*

E. A. Kincaid, A.B. State College of Washington 1910; A.M. Harvard 1911. The Locofoco Movement. *Harvard.*

R. C. McGrane, A.B. Cincinnati 1912, A.M. 1913. The Crisis of 1837. *Chicago.*

R. J. Ray, A.B. Kansas 1908, A.M. 1909. The History of the Financial Crises of 1837 and 1839 in the United States. *Harvard.*

D. R. Fox, A.B. Columbia 1911, A.M. 1912. The Campaign of 1840. *Columbia.*

W. O. Lynch, A.B. Indiana 1903; A.M. Wisconsin 1908. A History of the Whig Party in the Northwest from 1840. *Harvard.*

J. N. Norwood, A.B. Alfred 1906; A.M. Michigan 1909. The Slavery Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church. *Cornell.*

Martha L. Edwards, A.M. Wisconsin 1913. Religion and Politics, 1850–1860. *Wisconsin.*

Birl E. Schulz, A.B. DePauw 1909; A.M. Columbia 1911. Justice McLean and the Dred Scott Decision. *Columbia.*

H. A. Foster, A.B. Yale 1907; A.M. Chicago 1912. Life of John J. Crittenden. *Chicago.*

Wilfred Eldred, A.B. Washington and Lee 1909, A.M. 1909; A.M. Harvard 1911. Wheat Production and the Wheat and Flour Trade in the United States since 1860. *Harvard.*

A. R. Ellingwood, A.B. Colorado College 1910; B.C.L. Oxford 1913. Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Great Britain during the Civil War. *Pennsylvania.*

W. W. Pierson, jr., A.B. Alabama 1910, A.M. 1911; A.M. Columbia 1912. A History of the Committee on the Conduct of the War. *Columbia.*

F. C. White, A.B. Alfred 1895, A.M. 1902. The Draft during the Civil War. *Columbia.*

G. L. Kieffer, A.B. Pennsylvania College 1909. The Attitude of the Lutherans in America toward the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia.*

J. F. Ebersole, Ph.B. Chicago 1907; A.M. Harvard 1909. The History of the National Banking System, 1864–1874. *Chicago.*

O. C. Hormell, A.B. Indiana 1904, A.M. 1905; A.M. Harvard 1909. Contemporary Opinion respecting the Granting of Negro Suffrage. *Harvard.*

J. W. Oliver, A.B. Missouri 1911, A.M. 1912. History of the Pension Movement to 1885. *Wisconsin.*

W. C. Harris, Ph.B. Chicago 1904; A.M. Michigan 1909; Ph.D. Chicago 1914. The Public Career of Zachariah Chandler. *Chicago.*

E. D. Ross, Ph.B. Syracuse 1909, Ph.M. 1910; A.M. Cornell 1912. The Liberal Republican Movement. *Cornell.*

E. B. Patton, A.B. Washington 1904; A.M. Chicago 1907, Ph.D. 1908. Resumption of Specie Payment in 1879. *Chicago.*

G. D. Bradley, A.B. Michigan 1907, A.M. 1913. History of the Santa Fé Railroad. *Michigan.*

D. L. McMurry, A.B. Beloit 1911; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. The History of the Pension Movement, 1885 to present. *Wisconsin.*

J. Tanger, Ph.B. Franklin and Marshall 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1912. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States since 1889. *Pennsylvania.*

H. G. Hodges, Litt.B. Princeton 1911; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Great Britain, 1893–1897. *Pennsylvania.*

J. A. Dunaway, A.B. Park College 1910, A.M. 1912. Recent Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Japan. *Pennsylvania.*

AMERICA: IN LOCAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

P. W. Bidwell, A.B. Yale 1910. History of Agriculture in New England. *Yale.*

J. C. Zeller, A.B. Chicago 1904, B.D. 1905; A.M. Chattanooga 1906. History of New England Legislation on Education, 1776–1830. *Chicago.*

B. J. Baldwin, A.B. Wesleyan 1902; A.B. Yale 1903; B.D. Union Theological Seminary 1908. The Decay of the New England Parish. *Columbia.*

Mary Merrick Goodwin, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1909. The Massachusetts Colonial Agency in England. *Bryn Mawr.*

Blanche Evans Hazard, A.B. Radcliffe 1907, A.M. 1913. History of the Shoe Industry in Massachusetts. *Radcliffe.*

G. A. Wood, A.B. Amherst 1906. The Career of Governor William Shirley. *Columbia.*

H. H. Burbank, A.B. Dartmouth 1909, A.M. 1910. The History of the General Property Taxation in Massachusetts since 1775. *Harvard.*

W. F. Hall, A.B. Harvard 1909, A.M. 1910. The Political History of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, 1830–1840. *Harvard.*

J. W. E. Bowen, jr., A.B. Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Harvard 1913. The Political History of Massachusetts, 1840–1850. *Harvard.*

Edith E. Ware, A.B. Goucher 1905; A.M. Columbia 1908. Political Opinion in Massachusetts during the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia.*

G. S. Dow, A.B. William Jewell 1909; A.M. Brown 1911. The Social History of Martha's Vineyard. *Chicago.*

R. J. Purcell, A.B. Minnesota 1910, A.M. 1911. The Connecticut Constitution of 1818. *Yale.*

J. P. Senning, A.B. Union 1908. Legislation and Legislative Methods in Connecticut since 1818. *Yale.*

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

H. E. Brown, B.S. New York 1910, J.D. 1911, A.M. 1912. The Origin and Development of the Office of Public Prosecutor in the Colony of New York. *New York.*

R. B. Munson, Ph.B. Yale 1909, A.M. 1911. The Growth of Assembly Control in New York, 1700–1760. *Yale.*

R. F. Seybolt, Ph.B. Brown 1910, A.M. 1911. Education through the Apprenticeship System in Colonial New York. *Columbia.*

J. P. Selden, A.B. Olivet 1900; A.M. New York 1912. The Development of the Office of Mayor in New York City. *New York.*

A. E. Peterson, A.B. Tufts 1888, A.M. 1892. New York as an Eighteenth-Century Municipality to 1730. *Columbia,*

G. W. Edwards, A.B. City of New York 1911. New York as an Eighteenth Century Municipality, 1730–1776. *Columbia.*

A. O. Miller, jr., A.B. New York 1893, LL.B. 1895; LL.M. Columbia 1896; J.D. New York 1908. The Revolutionary Government of the State of New York, Central and Local. *New York.*

W. W. Feigenbaum, A.B. Columbia 1907, A.M. 1908. Ratification of the Federal Constitution in New York. *Columbia.*

C. A. Phillips, A.B. Central 1904; A.B. Yale 1908, A.M. 1909. History of Manufactures in New York. *Yale.*

M. B. Foster, A.B. Carson and Newman 1910, A.M. 1911. A History of Banking in the State of New York. *Cornell.*

M. A. Hunter, A.B. Muskingum 1912; A.M. Princeton 1913. A History of Corporation Taxes in New York State. *Cornell.*

L. A. Frye, A.B. Minnesota 1907, A.M. 1908. History of the State Control of Public Service Corporations in New York. *Columbia.*

R. H. Gabriel, A.B. Yale 1913. The Economic History of Long Island. *Yale.*

Mary Alice Hanna, A.B. Missouri 1909, B.S. 1911. Colonial Trade of Pennsylvania. *Bryn Mawr.*

M. K. Turner, A.B. Dickinson 1905; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Commercial Relations of the Susquehanna Valley during the Eighteenth Century. *Pennsylvania.*

A. L. Trachtenberg, A.B. Trinity 1911; A.M. Yale 1912. The History of Mining Legislation in Pennsylvania. *Yale.*

H. W. Kochenderfer, A.B. Ursinus 1901; A.M. Pennsylvania 1911. Pennsylvania during the Civil War. *Pennsylvania.*

R. R. Ammarell, A.B. Muhlenberg 1911; A.M. Columbia 1912. The Politics of Pennsylvania during the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia.*

C. E. Asnis, A.B. Pennsylvania 1904, LL.B. 1907, A.M. 1913. The Revision of the State Constitution of Pennsylvania, with Special Reference to Finance and Taxation. *Pennsylvania.*

F. W. Breimeier, A.B. Bucknell 1910; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. The Struggle for Municipal Home Rule in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

H. B. Crothers, A.B. Monmouth 1903. The Defence of the Colonies of Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas, 1750–1756. *Yale.*

Lily F. Trevvett, A.B. Richmond (Va.) 1909. Loyalism in Maryland. *Johns Hopkins.*

F. J. Tschan, A.B. Loyola 1901, A.M. 1903. The Virginia Plantation. *Chicago.*

D. C. MacBryde, A.B. Washington and Lee 1896; A.M. Yale 1912. Planter and Plantation in Early Virginia. *Yale.*

P. S. Flippin, A.B. Richmond (Va.) 1906. Royal Government in Virginia. *Johns Hopkins.*

G. F. Wells, B.S. Columbia 1907, A.M. 1908. Educational Conditions in Colonial Virginia, as shown through the Parish Records. *Columbia.*

G. V. Burroughs, S.B. Whitman 1909; A.M. Chicago 1912. History of the Virginia House of Burgesses in the Eighteenth Century. *Chicago.*

L. K. Koontz, A.B. Washington and Lee 1908. The Virginia Frontier in the French and Indian Wars. *Johns Hopkins.*

J. M. Leake, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1902. The Virginia Committee System of the American Revolution. *Johns Hopkins.*

E. L. Fox, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1909. Political Parties in Virginia, 1776–1801. *Johns Hopkins.*

E. J. Woodhouse, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1903; LL.B. Virginia 1907. Virginia and Nullification. *Chicago.*

W. W. Carson, A.B. Wofford 1907; A.M. Trinity 1908. Social and Economic Reconstruction in North Carolina. *Wisconsin.*

W. S. Boyce, A.B. Wake Forest 1903; A.M. Chicago 1907. The Social and Economic History of Eastern North Carolina since 1890. *Columbia.*

A. A. Hirsh, A.B. Cornell 1901; B.D. Chicago 1907. The Huguenots in South Carolina. *Chicago.*

D. H. Bacot, jr., A.B. Charleston 1908, A.M. 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Progress of South Carolina, 1783–1800. *Harvard.*

W. B. Smith, A.B. Chicago 1902. White Servitude in South Carolina. *Chicago.*

C. S. Boucher, A.B. Michigan 1909, A.M. 1910. South Carolina Politics from Nullification to Secession. *Michigan.*

Laura A. White, A.B. Nebraska 1904. The Life of Robert Barnwell Rhett. *Chicago.*

F. K. Deming, Ph.B. Drake 1908, A.M. 1911. The Relations of South Carolina to the Confederate Government. *Chicago.*

D. T. Herndon, B.S. Alabama Polytechnic Institute 1902, M.S. 1903. The Secession Movement in Georgia in 1850. *Chicago.*

T. H. Jack, A.B. Alabama 1902, A.M. 1903; A.M. Harvard 1908. The Opposition to Secession in Alabama. *Chicago.*

N. M. M. Surrey, B.S. Chicago 1903; A.M. Wisconsin 1909. History of Commerce and Industry in Louisiana during the French Régime. *Columbia.*

C. B. Goodykoontz, A.B. Colorado 1912; A.M. California 1914. The Province of Louisiana under Spain. *California.*

E. P. Puckett, A.B. Howard (Ala.) 1903; A.M. Tulane 1907. The Free Negro in Louisiana. *Harvard.*

WESTERN STATES

P. J. Stoneberg, A.B. Knox College 1899, A.M. 1901; A.M. Columbia 1905. Early Land Speculation in the Northwest Territory. *Columbia.*

W. E. Stevens, A.B. Knox 1913; A.M. Illinois 1914. The Fur-Trade in the Great Lakes Region after 1783. *Illinois.*

B. H. Schockel, S.B. Chicago 1911, S.M. 1913. The Historical Geography of the Lead Region of Illinois-Wisconsin-Iowa. *Chicago.*

H. H. Bass, Litt.B. Wisconsin 1902, Litt.M. 1903. The Woollen Industry in the Mississippi Valley prior to the Introduction of the Factory System. *Harvard.*

Isaac Lippincott, A.B. Harvard 1902; A.M. Washington 1908; Ph.D. Chicago 1912. The History of Manufactures in the Ohio Valley to 1860. *Chicago.*

R. S. Cotterill, A.B. Kentucky Wesleyan 1904; A.M. Virginia 1907. Organized Railroad-Booming in the Mississippi Valley, 1837–1857. *Wisconsin.*

H. C. Hubbart, A.B. Chicago 1904. Disunion Sentiment in the Northwest, 1860–1861. *Chicago.*

W. C. Spielman, A.B. Cincinnati 1905, A.M. 1907. The Economic Basis of Ohio Politics, 1803–1870. *Johns Hopkins.*

C. C. Huntington, B.S. Antioch 1896; Ph.B. Ohio State 1902, A.M. 1903. A History of Banking and Currency in Ohio prior to the Civil War. *Cornell.*

E. F. Colburn, A.B. Miami 1907; A.M. Cincinnati 1908. The Republican Party in Ohio, 1854–1865. *Chicago.*

I. C. Hamilton, A.B. Indiana 1900; Ph.D. Chicago 1907. The History of Administration in Illinois. *Chicago.*

J. F. Lee, A.B. Des Moines 1904; A.M. Iowa 1905; Ph.D. Chicago 1913. Transportation as a Factor in the Development of Illinois. *Chicago.*

J. J. Kile, A.B. Rockford 1912; A.M. Illinois 1914. The German Settlement in Illinois. *Illinois.*

C. L. Stewart, A.B. Illinois Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Illinois 1912. Farm Tenure in Illinois since 1880. *Illinois.*

C. A. Hanford, A.B. Illinois 1912, A.M. 1913. Commission Government in the Cities of Illinois. *Illinois.*

Clara Crawford, Ph.B. Chicago 1911, A.M. 1912. History of Legislation concerning Education in Michigan and Wisconsin. *Chicago.*

L. G. Cooper, A.B. Michigan 1904, A.M. 1910. Political Campaigns of the Civil War in Michigan. *Michigan.*

F. B. Streeter, A.B. Kansas 1911, A.M. 1912. History of Political Parties in Michigan, 1844–1860. *Michigan.*

A. E. Parkins, A.M. Michigan State Normal College 1911; S.B. Chicago 1912, Ph.D. 1914. The Historical Geography of Detroit. *Chicago.*

V. J. Farrar, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. Public Land Policy of Wisconsin. *Wisconsin.*

Katharine J. Gallagher, A.B. Vassar 1909; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. The Missionary Career of the Right Rev. Jackson Kemper, in the Northwest, 1835–1859. *Wisconsin.*

Fred Merk, A.B. Wisconsin 1911. Economic History of Wisconsin in the Civil War. *Wisconsin.*

C. J. Posey, S.B. Illinois 1900; S.M. Chicago 1905. The Historical Geography of St. Paul. *Chicago.*

C. O. Sauer, A.B. Central Wesleyan 1908. The Historical Geography of the Ozark Region of Missouri. *Chicago.*

J. D. Hicks, A.B. Northwestern 1913, A.M. 1914. Constitutional Development in the Far Western States since the Civil War. *Wisconsin.*

L. F. Jackson, A.B. North Dakota 1902; Ph.M. Chicago 1909. The History of Protestant Missions to the Sioux and Chippewa Indians. *Harvard.*

Roy Gittinger, A.B. Oklahoma 1902; A.M. Chicago 1906. The Evolution of the State of Oklahoma, 1870–1906. *California.*

J. L. Kingsbury, A.B. Dartmouth 1905. The Formation of the Colorado Territory. *Chicago.*

L. P. Fox, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. The Populist Movement in Colorado, 1890–1896. *Pennsylvania.*

L. E. Young, B.S. Utah 1895. The Social and Economic History of Utah under the Leadership of Brigham Young. *Columbia.*

J. J. Hill, A.B. Brigham Young College 1909. The Economic Foundation of the Mormon Church. *California.*

C. W. Hackett, A.B. Texas 1909; A.M. California 1914. The Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico in 1680. *California.*

Clement Akerman, A.B. Georgia 1898. Studies in the Economic History of the Pacific Northwest. *Harvard.*

C. E. Chapman, A.B. Tufts 1902; LL.B. Harvard 1905; A.M. California 1909. The Anza Expedition to California, 1775–1776. *California.*

W. H. Ellison, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1904; A.M. California 1913. The Indian Policy of the United States in California, 1847–1876. *California.*

Mary Floyd Williams, A.B. California 1913. The San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1851–1856. *California.*

O. C. Coy, Ph.B. Pacific 1907; A.M. Leland Stanford 1909. The Settlement and Development of the Humboldt River Region, California. *California.*

AMERICA OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

S. M. Eastman, A.B. Toronto 1907. Canada in the Seventeenth Century. *Columbia.*

R. D. Cahall, Ph.B. Kenyon College 1908. The Sovereign Council of New France. *Columbia.*

J. S. Custer, A.B. William Jewell 1907; B.A. Oxford 1910. The Canadian Constitutional Act of 1791. *Wisconsin.*

W. C. Clark, A.M. Queen's 1910. The History of the Canadian Grain Trade. *Harvard.*

G. C. Davidson, A.B. Toronto 1906; A.M. California, 1908. The Westward Movement in Canada. *California.*

R. R. Hill, A.B. Eureka 1900. The Office of Viceroy in Colonial Spanish America. *Columbia.*

Vera Lee Brown, A.B. McGill 1912, A.M. 1913. The Audiencia in Colonial Spanish America. *Bryn Mawr.*

H. I. Priestley, A.B. Southern California 1900, A.M. 1907. Joseph Galvez in New Spain. *California.*

Mary W. Williams, A.B. Leland Stanford 1907, A.M. 1908. The Relations of England and the United States in Central America since 1815. *Leland Stanford.*

J. B. Lockey, B.S. Peabody College 1902; A.M. Columbia 1909. Latin America and the Monroe Doctrine. *Columbia.*

D. G. Munro, A.B. Wisconsin 1912. The Monroe Doctrine as applied to Central America. *Pennsylvania.*

W. C. Westergaard, A.B. North Dakota 1906; M.L. California 1910. The Danish West Indies under Company and King, 1670–1770. *California.*

Eleanor C. Buckley, A.B. Texas 1908, A.M. 1909. The Economic Forces underlying Latin-American Independence. *Pennsylvania.*

W. T. Morrey, A.B. Ohio State 1888; A.M. New York 1893. Bolivar and the Spanish-American Revolution. *Columbia.*

E. E. Vann, A.B. Birmingham College (Alabama) 1902; B.D. Vanderbilt 1907. The Abolition of Slavery in Brazil. *Columbia.*

Henry Gil, Barrister Univ. of La Plata 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1911. The Foreign Policy of the Argentine Republic on the American Continent. *Pennsylvania.*

DISSERTATIONS PRINTED SINCE DECEMBER, 1913

A. B. West, *The Chalcidic League.* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Bulletin, 1914.)

C. B. Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity.* (New York, Longmans, 1914.)

Maude A. Huttmann, *Persecution and Toleration in the Early Fourth Century.* (New York, Longmans, 1914.)

N. S. B. Gras, *The Evolution of the English Corn Market, 1100–1700.* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1914.)

S. B. Terry, *Financing the Hundred Years War, 1337–1360.* (London, London School of Economics, 1914.)

Violet Barbour, *Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington.* (Washington, American Historical Association, in press.)

F. A. Golder, *Russian Expansion on the Pacific, 1641–1850.* (Cleveland, The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1914.)

E. M. North, *Some Social Consequences of the Wesleyan Revival.* (Privately printed.)

Ahmed Emin, *The Development of Modern Turkey as measured by its Press.* (Privately printed.)

P. C. Phillips, *The West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution.* (University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. II., nos. 2 and 3.)

Rachel C. Eaton, *John Ross and the Cherokee Nation.* (Menasha, Wis., Geo. Banta.)

B. B. Kendrick, *The Journal of the Joint Committee of Fifteen on Reconstruction.* (New York, Longmans, 1914.)

Elsie M. Rushmore, *The Indian Policy during Grant's Administration.* (Privately printed.)

D. C. Sowers, *The Financial History of New York State.* (Privately printed.)

A. J. Hall, *Religious Education in the Public Schools of the State of New York.* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1914.)

Margaret S. Morriss, *Colonial Trade of Maryland.* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Studies, 1914.)

H. M. Henry, *The Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina.* (Emory, Va., 1914.)

J. R. McCain, *Georgia as a Proprietary Province.* (Privately printed.)

R. P. Brooks, *History of Land Tenure in Georgia, 1865–1910.* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Bulletin, 1914.)

Cleo Hearon, *Mississippi and the Compromise of 1850.* (University, Mississippi Historical Society, 1913.)

H. A. Trexler, *Slavery in Missouri, 1804–1865.* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Studies, 1914.)

T. M. Marshall, *The History of the Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase, 1819–1841.* (University of California Press, 1914.)

W. J. Trimble, *The Mining Advance into the Inland Empire.* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Bulletin, 1914.)

Cardinal Goodwin, *The Establishment of State Government in California, 1848–1850.* (New York, Macmillan, 1914.)

T. L. Stoddard, *The French Revolution in San Domingo.* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1914.)

Volume XX] *April, 1915* [*Number 3*

The

American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION IN CHICAGO

TWO previous meetings of the American Historical Association had been held in Chicago. That of 1893 occurred in the summer, in connection with the great World's Fair then in progress, and was much overshadowed by that event, with whose brilliant attractions it was impossible for history to compete. That of December, 1904, opening with a blizzard which figures in the memory of those present so vividly as to obscure remembrance of the fine weather that followed, suffered from the amiable attempt toward "recognizing" various institutions by holding sessions in too many places. In the Chicago December, institutions in which such sessions may be held are separated from one another by bleak miles of wintry air, moving with notorious velocity. The committee charged with the arrangements for the sessions of December, 1914, wisely arranged that, so far as was possible, they should all be held under one roof, that of the Auditorium Hotel. Here there were most ample facilities for the holding of sessions large and small, for committee meetings, and for conversation; apparently there has never been a meeting more notable for social pleasure of members with members. Entertainments on the part of the city were wisely kept, by the committee on arrangements, to a minimum of what was offered—a luncheon on the first day, a reception on the first evening, tendered by the Art Institute of Chicago, a tea by the Chicago College Club, and a smoker by the University Club. The Caxton Club and the Chicago Literary Club threw open their rooms, the Chicago Historical Society its building; the Newberry Library gave a special exhibition of rare Americana drawn from the wonderful collection presented to it by the munificence of Mr. Edward E. Ayer.

The only sessions held outside the walls of the Auditorium Hotel and the Fine Arts Building connected with it were those of the first two evenings, when provision had to be made for larger popular audiences. These sessions were held near by, in Fullerton Hall of the Art Institute of Chicago. On the first, there was an address of welcome by Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson, chairman of the local committee of arrangements, followed by the presidential address of Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, of the University of Chicago, president of the Association, which, under the title "American History and American Democracy", we have had the pleasure of printing in our January issue The exercises were followed by a most agreeable reception, held amid the impressive treasures of Chicago's remarkable art collection. On all these occasions, and throughout the whole meeting, the careful forethought of the local committee of arrangements, of its chairman, and of its secretary, Professor James A. James, of Northwestern University, were everywhere apparent.

With them should be joined, in the grateful recollection of the members, the committee on the programme, and its chairman, Professor James W. Thompson, of the University of Chicago; and first, because of the relative simplicity of the programme. With one exception, made for special reasons, there was no time when more than two sessions or sections were going on simultaneously. Abundance of time, the whole of the second afternoon, was allowed for the annual business meeting, in whose proceedings the lack of time has often bred a rate of speed savoring too much of mechanism. There were sessions or sections devoted to ancient history, to medieval history, to the medieval history of England in particular, to modern English history, to the history of Napoleonic Europe, to the history of the relations between Europe and the Orient, and to American history. There was a joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, devoted to Western history, the usual conference of the representatives of historical societies, and the usual conference of archivists; while the second evening session was general in character, assembling several papers having especial attraction for a public audience.

It is of some interest to compare the programme with that of the meeting held ten years ago in the same city. The most noteworthy feature of the earlier occasion was the presence of several noted European historical scholars—Païs and Keutgen and Milyoukov; the condition of Europe, oppressed by warfare of the most appalling magnitude, put all such visits out of the question in the

present year. The meeting of 1904 was held in conjunction with the American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association; the recent meeting was confined to history (though the Political Science Association was meeting in an adjoining hotel), and no other society was present save the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. Several papers on that former occasion dealt with European archives; the annual conference of archivists, which in recent years has been so useful, had not then been founded. The conference of state and local historical societies, on the other hand, a gathering which has less completely vindicated its claim to practical importance yet has not been without results, dates its inception from 1904. Practical conferences of teachers were then more in vogue, and three were held on that occasion, for the consideration of the teaching of history in elementary schools, of the doctoral dissertation, and of the teaching of church history respectively. One such conference has usually been maintained in the subsequent meetings, with some useful effects and some threshing of old pedagogical straw; this year there was none.

The attendance upon the meeting was unusually large. The registration was recorded as 400, and has been surpassed in only two cases, that of the New York meeting of 1909, the Association's twenty-fifth anniversary, and that of the Boston meeting of 1912. Naturally, the attendance was chiefly from the Middle West, but not a few came from New York and the East.

The general organization of the programme has already been described, and it may be as well, when considering it in detail, to proceed rather in the natural or chronological order of the papers than in the order in which they were arranged on the programme. First among the papers in ancient history would come, in such an arrangement, one which did not figure in the conference or section of ancient history, but was given separately, as a brief illustrated lecture before the more public audience of the second evening, Professor James H. Breasted's brilliant talk on the Eastern Mediterranean and the Earliest Civilizations in Europe. Beginning with a time when all Europe was in a stage of neolithic barbarism, and when, in the thirtieth century B. C., Egypt was the one thoroughly centralized and highly civilized state bordering on the Mediterranean, he made a selection from among the surviving material evidences which show the existence and character of the cultural influences setting from the Orient toward Europe. In the main, this was achieved by exhibiting a number of architectural sequences of which the earlier members were found in the ancient Orient,

while the later, passing to Europe, furnished fundamental forms to European civilization—the clerestory and the basilica, the Assyrian palace front and the Roman triumphal arch, the Babylonian temple tower and the Christian church spire. The forms of writing, the conceptions and emblems of the state, were marshalled in series with similar ingenuity. With only selected fragments of the evidence, and with long gaps between, it was impossible for the address to be always convincing, but it was always instructive and illuminating.

In the conference proper on ancient history, the first paper read was that of Professor Robert W. Rogers of Drew Theological Seminary, entitled Fresh Light upon the History of the Earliest Assyrian Period. Mr. Wallace E. Caldwell, fellow in Columbia University, discussed the Greek Attitude towards Peace and War. The earlier Greek poets were in general warlike in sympathies and expression. With the beginning of the fifth century this attitude changed. The poets praised the glories and blessings of peace and set forth in telling phrases the horrors of war, particularly the sufferings caused by the loss of the city's finest men. A feeling for humanity and a breadth of view that sympathized with the sufferings on both sides developed during the Peloponnesian War. During the fourth century the economic arguments as to loss through interference with business and the burdens of war taxes were more prominently advanced. At the same time there came more widespread attempts to prevent war through peace conferences and arbitration, which pointed also to a growing community of interests that made peace more necessary. The modernness of the points of view and of the arguments for peace and against war were made particularly evident.

Dr. William D. Gray of Smith College, in a paper on Hadrian and his Reign, put forth the view that the cosmopolitanism of Hadrian has been exaggerated. One of his main purposes was to protect the Greco-Roman civilization of the Roman empire from corrupting influences—particularly from the influences of northern barbarism and of Orientalism—and to give to this civilization a more Roman character. This purpose can be traced in his surrender of Trajan's conquests, in frontier lines designed to exclude barbarian influences, in the military reforms by which he endeavored to restore the Roman character and discipline to the army, in his reforms in Rome and Italy, in his provincial administration, and in his Roman and somewhat anti-Oriental religious policy. But his immediate successors did not adopt his methods, his later suc-

cessors did not share his ideas. As a political innovator Hadrian is perhaps the forerunner of the later empire, but as the defender of a civilization he is one of the last great representatives of classical antiquity.

The paper by Professor William L. Westermann of the University of Wisconsin, on the Decline of Ancient Culture, we shall have the pleasure of printing in this journal, at a later time. For the present it may suffice to say that, rejecting for various reasons six explanations currently offered for the decline of the classical civilization—slavery, depopulation, taxation, the drain of the precious metals to India, Christianity, and the entrance of the barbarians into the Roman Empire—he resorted to economic considerations resting on the antithesis between two concurrent systems, not adjusted into harmony by the Romans, that of the industrial city, inherited from the Greeks, and that of the great agricultural estate, inherited from the Hellenistic rulers, and developing into the imperial domain. Decline of industrial freedom, lessened production, reversion to an economy injurious to intellectual vigor and initiative, preceded the decline of ancient culture.

An advanced moment in medieval culture was dealt with in a paper by Professor Edgar H. McNeal of the Ohio State University, on the Feudal Noble and the Church as reflected in the Poems of Chrestien de Troyes. Of the same period was the essay by Professor Frederic Duncalf of the University of Texas, on Some Effects of Environment in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The Europeans, who attempted to found colonies in Syria in the twelfth century, had none of the preparation for such a task that a more advanced civilization might have given. In the most difficult phase of their task, relationship with the Oriental peoples, they were most successful. They learned toleration and appreciation, and even generosity as rulers. Alliances with the Mohammedans furthered friendly relations. If the colonists never obtained any real understanding of Eastern character they gained a practical knowledge of the East, adapting themselves in many ways to their environment, despite constant interference by the less appreciative pilgrims coming afresh from the West. Their great failure is to be found in the type of government that they established in the East, for the Crusades developed individualism to such a degree that the colonies failed to establish a strong, centralized government, although the frontier situation demanded such unity.

Under the title "Roger Bacon, 1214–1914", Professor Earle W. Dow of Michigan presented a commemorative essay, apropos

of the seventh centenary of Bacon's birth. In the light of Bacon's principal writings and of recent studies, he traced his intellectual formation and the main lines of his thinking, and considered the quality of his achievement. Despite the limits to that accomplishment which various students have lately pointed out, the fullness and grasp of Bacon's knowledge, the problems and suggestions he passed to others, and his appreciation of the power of observation and experiment, give him a significant part in the earlier development of modern science. And yet it may be more just to Bacon to regard his effort and achievement as lying primarily in the human field—to enroll him chiefly among those who studied to find solutions for pressing problems in the conduct of human affairs.

To illustrate the use which may be made of the material bearing upon the papal tax on clerical incomes, Professor Lunt of Cornell presented, under the title Papal Finance and Papal Diplomacy in the Thirteenth Century, an account of the tax imposed by Gregory X. in 1274 and the opposition to it. The tenth of England, Wales, Ireland, and perhaps Scotland, was to go to Edward I. provided he undertook a crusade. This he announced in 1283 that he could not do. Later he agreed to take the cross, and asked that the tenth be granted to him. The result of the long negotiation which followed was that he received from the pope a grant, though he did not undertake the crusade. The papacy had paid the expenses of collection, and had borne the brunt of the opposition to the tax, while the king had acquired the larger part of the revenue.

In a session devoted to medieval England, four papers were read. We summarize first that of Professor James F. Willard of the University of Colorado, on a Reform of the Exchequer under Edward I. During the first half of that reign, the revenues of the crown were received by two departments of the government, the exchequer of receipt, or lower exchequer, and the wardrobe, the ordinary revenue flowing in general into the lower exchequer and the extraordinary revenue into the wardrobe, which normally received the greater part of the income of the crown. In 1290, under the direction of William de Marchia, the newly appointed treasurer of the exchequer, a revolution was brought about which has hitherto escaped the notice of financial historians. Thereafter the exchequer of receipt was the department of the government into which the greater part of both the ordinary and extraordinary revenue flowed. This revolution laid the foundation for the future importance of the lower exchequer; it was accompanied by the appearance of several new series of financial records.

The second paper of the group, by Miss Bertha H. Putnam of Mount Holyoke College, related to Minimum Wage Laws for Priests after the Black Death, 1346–1381. A large proportion of the stipendiary clergy died during the great plague; the survivors attempted to benefit from the national calamity by obtaining increased salaries, precisely as the laboring classes were endeavoring to secure higher wages. Thereupon the great ecclesiastics framed canons specifying maximum salaries for priests, closely resembling the maximum wage laws for laborers, passed by Parliament. By means of manuscript and printed ecclesiastical sources such as the episcopal registers, Miss Putnam followed out the administrative enforcement of these regulations and the legal problems, such as those relating to conflict of jurisdiction. We print her paper in a later number.

A paper by Professor N. M. Trenholme of Missouri, on Municipal Aspects of the Rising of 1381 in England, attempted to bring out in a definite way the important part played by the towns of southeastern England, especially London, in the great popular uprising. The writer took the position that the agrarian discontent was fomented and developed by dissatisfied and radical townsmen. A second and more important matter was the co-operation of the inhabitants of the towns in the revolt, greatly increasing the popular army which advanced on London. In the case of London itself, it was pointed out how a radical element of the Victuallers' party, then in control of the city government, admitted the mob from outside, and how many of the lower elements of London society joined the rebels. Municipal disorders in outside royal boroughs and in towns under mesne lordship were briefly referred to, and the somewhat negative municipal results of the rising were commented on.

Last in this group of papers was one by Professor James F. Baldwin of Vassar College, on Historic Cases before the King's Council. The records of the council abound in cases which are a reflection of the political and social interests of their time. As an example, the case of Ughtred *v.* Musgrave in 1366 may be taken as a segment of the history of the sheriff—a case in which the council, after a searching examination of specific charges, condemned the influential sheriff of Yorkshire for arresting men without warrant, indictment, or other process of law. It was because of such abuses of power, which were possible through the packing of juries and the procuring of indictments, that the judicial functions of the sheriffs were gradually reduced and given over mainly to the justices of the peace. These materials are valuable not only

for the history of law, but also for the general historian, and even have their uses for the legal reformer.

The paper by Professor Albert H. Lybyer of Illinois, on the Influence of the Rise of the Ottoman Turks upon the Routes of Oriental Trade, showed that, contrary to a view which has often prevailed, the Ottoman Turks did not greatly, if at all on the whole, increase the difficulties of Oriental traffic or make imperative the discovery of the new routes of trade to the East. Indirect evidence is found in the prices of spices in Western Europe, which were not permanently raised before the year 1500. The legend of the Turkish responsibility for the great maritime discoveries—held by Thorold Rogers in opposition to the evidence which his own statistics afford—seems a survival of the belief that the fall of Constantinople was the determining event of modern history. In the latter part of the paper the author reviewed the course of Oriental trade from the time of the great crusades, showing the actual influence exercised upon it by the Turks.

For the period between the medieval and the modern, there was a valuable paper by Mr. A. Edward Harvey of Chicago, on Economic Self-Interest in the German Anti-Clericalism of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. The influence of papal exactions is familiar; but other subjects of common complaint were the tithes, feudal dues and services, charges for the sacraments or other religious performances of the priests, and a multitude of "voluntary" offerings urged by the secular clergy as well as by mendicant friars and nuns. Less familiar were the endowments for anniversaries and other services for the dead, the mortgages requiring perpetual annual payments, the burdens of lease-rents, the exemption of the clergy from taxes and tolls and import-duties, and the resulting damage to municipal revenues and to competing merchants and craftsmen. While other motives for anti-clericalism are equally discernible, the economic factor was much more widely operative in the success of Protestantism than historians have heretofore been able or willing to concede.

In a paper entitled "The Turco-Venetian Treaty of 1540" Mr. Theodore F. Jones of the University of New York sketched, largely from letters in Venetian archives, the course of the negotiations between Venice and Turkey from 1538 to 1540. He also showed how the final diplomatic defeat of Venice—which was compelled to surrender her Levantine seaports, and pay a large indemnity to Turkey—was probably due to the treachery of secretaries of the Seigniory, as a result of which the secret instructions of the Vene-

tian envoy were brought, through the agency of the French ambassador, to the knowledge of the Turkish government. He further suggested how, apparently, evidence of this treachery came to light and resulted in the punishment of some of the wrongdoers.

In a session devoted to the history of modern England four papers were read, chiefly relating to the constitutional history of the seventeenth century. Professor Henry R. Shipman of Princeton presented the subject of the House of Commons and Disputed Elections, as an illustration of the development of parliamentary privilege in general. Beginning with a detailed description of the Norfolk election case of 1586, and with allusion to other instances in the last years of Queen Elizabeth, he discussed the doctrine concerning the rights of the Commons laid down by that body in the Fortescue and Goodwin case (1604) and showed the Commons' assertion as to ancient privilege to be without foundation. The Aylesbury election cases in 1704 and that of John Wilkes's re-election in 1770 were used to illustrate the conflicts between the House and the courts. The paper concluded by showing that the underlying cause of the contests was the multiplicity of laws existing together, the law of Parliament and the common law conflicting because the lines between the legislative and the judicial powers of Parliament had not been clearly drawn.

The paper by Professor Edward R. Turner of Michigan, on the Privy Council of 1679, was a discussion of the authorship, purposes, and results of the sudden substitution by Charles II., for the old privy council, of a lesser body of thirty, consisting only partly of the old members. Temple claims the authorship, and probably put the plan into form. The motive was political, King Charles, in dire straits, trying to placate critics by the change but not intending to abandon the practice of holding private meetings of a select and governing few. The results were disappointing. Parliament received the innovation coldly, the friends of royalty felt aggrieved, the procedure soon came to be much the same as before, and the king soon treated the new council with neglect.

In treating the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and the Revolution of 1689, Professor Clarence C. Crawford, of the University of Kansas, called attention first to the close relation between the struggle for constitutional restrictions upon the royal prerogative and the establishment of the guarantees of personal liberty. The paper discussed the legal principles involved in the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, the conditions which were believed to justify the arbitrary power of arresting persons upon suspicion of high

treason and holding them in prison without benefit of bail or trial, and the methods by which that power was exercised. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended at nine different periods between 1689 and 1818. The methods and practices employed in 1689, when the machinery of government was badly deranged by the Revolution, were made the precedent for all subsequent suspensions of the act.

The fourth of the papers in the session for modern English history, that of Professor Herbert C. Bell of Bowdoin College, on British Commercial Policy in the West Indies, 1783–1793, dealt with the regulation by the British government of the trade between the United States and the British West Indies. The scarcity of food and lumber in the West Indies during the Revolutionary War gave additional ground for the assumption that the islands must be permitted to trade freely in raw produce with the United States. But such a departure from the principles of the old commercial system was strongly opposed, particularly by ship-owners and by those who apprehended American competition. Pitt's attempt, in the Shelburne administration, to open the trade to the Americans without restriction, was defeated. Under the Coalition, the wishes of Fox were overborne by the North section of the Cabinet, and the American trade was confined to British ships. Pitt, on becoming prime minister, held a careful investigation, which resulted in the vindication, retention, and permanent adoption of the system established by the Coalition, a system advantageous to both planters and ship-owners.

Two sessions were devoted to the history of Napoleonic Europe, not unreasonably in view of the centenary of 1815, however different the manner in which that centenary is observed in the world at large from what was expected when the programme was first framed. The first of these sessions was devoted to the reading of papers, without discussion—which indeed was the prevailing method in the Chicago sessions; the other was a practical conference. In the former, one paper, that of Professor Guy S. Ford of Minnesota, printed on a later page, related to a subject in Prussian history of the Napoleonic period, Boyen's military law; the other two were of French themes, An Approach to a Study of Napoleon's Generalship, by Professor R. M. Johnston of Harvard, and the Senate of the First Empire, by Professor Victor Coffin of Wisconsin.

Mr. Johnston declared that a study of Napoleon's generalship should pursue three lines: first, what Napoleon learned of the art of war as it existed in his youth; second, what came from his per-

sonal genius; third, what came from the French Revolution. The stress should be laid, in the first division of the study, on the improvements in artillery which took place between 1763 and 1792: the field pieces were made lighter, muzzle velocities increased, and the use of grape-shot developed. In the second division of the study, the "geometrical bias" of Napoleon's mind and his "psychologico-dramatic sense" are the qualities which seem to differentiate him from other generals. And lastly, the French Revolution had broken down army discipline, had encouraged individual intelligence and initiative. A study of Napoleon's career as a whole shows that he failed to keep pace with the new school of warfare which was developing.

Mr. Coffin, in his study of the imperial Senate, described his subject as of interest rather from the political than the institutional point of view; the tracing of its construction and manipulation throws a flood of light on the whole imperial system. But the decline of the Senate from the position assigned to it by Siéyès to a condition of absorption by the executive, is accompanied by the assignment to it, as a trusty agent, of a constitutional authority beyond even that intended by Siéyès, and of administrative functions of unusual interest. The former was an amplification of the powers indicated by the term *Sénat Conservateur*; the latter were associated with these powers and were operated through the establishment of the *Senatoreries*. In the divisions of the Empire so-named (33 in number) the leading Senators exercised a confidential supervision over all public authorities and activities; the periodical reports that form the record of this supervision constitute an unused and valuable source of information as to the conditions of the period.

In the practical conference, already mentioned, the principal paper was presented by Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University, on Tendencies and Opportunities in Napoleonic Studies. The wealth of contemporary materials and the widespread interest of the French in their great popular movement, the French Revolution, were contrasted with the scantier materials and the lesser interest in the Napoleonic period, while in the other European countries the period of the monarchical struggle against the French Revolution has lacked materials and interest in comparison with the period of the national struggles against Napoleon. The progress of French writings regarding the Napoleonic era, and of writings in other countries, down to 1891, was recounted. Various causes have made the period since 1891 the period of monographs and the

period of most widespread interest in Napoleonic studies. In that year were published the memoirs of Marbot and Talleyrand, and the remarkable monographs of Vandal and Tatistcheff on Napoleon and the Tsar Alexander. The publications in each country since 1891 were then reviewed, with especially full attention to those of France. While military and biographical subjects had been the main interest during the earlier periods, the present period has been marked by increasing attention to diplomatic, religious, economic, administrative, social, and other aspects of the Napoleonic period.

In closing, the speaker referred to the library facilities in the United States for Napoleonic studies, to the varying degrees of attention given to the study of the period in American colleges and universities, and finally to the almost total neglect of the period as a subject for doctoral dissertations, except by Professor Lingelbach of the University of Pennsylvania. Professor Lingelbach then discussed some of the most important economic studies of the period written in Europe, and emphasized the opportunities for Napoleonic studies in this country. Professor Ford of Minnesota referred to the German phases of the period, but laid stress on the necessity for avoiding narrow views in its study, and for considering the broader relations and currents of historical development. In a similar spirit Professor Morse Stephens urged the study of the period not as the history of Napoleon, or of France, or of any single nation, but as a complete whole.

Professor Colby's paper on the Early Relations of England and Belgium dealt chiefly with events which fall between 1788 and 1870. The first incident to be considered was the revolt of the Austrian Netherlands in 1789–1790. This subject was approached from the standpoint of English relations with Prussia, as reflecting Pitt's unwillingness that the Belgian seacoast should be held either by a power unfriendly to England or by a power so weak as to invite attack. Reference was also made to the bearing which the Belgian situation had on England's attitude towards Prussian ambitions regarding Danzig and Thorn. The greater part of the paper, however, was concerned with the share which England took in events consequent to the Belgian Revolution of 1830. The negotiations between Palmerston and Talleyrand were considered in some detail, both as affecting the neutralization of Belgium and as related to the desire of the forward party in France to secure a portion of the Belgian soil through rectification of the frontier. The subsequent development of English public opinion regarding Belgium was also touched on, and a concluding statement was made as to the attitude

of Disraeli and Gladstone towards Belgian neutrality, at the outbreak of the Franco-German War. With some changes of form, the paper will appear later in this journal.

Last among the papers in European history we may mention two which dealt with Russian affairs. Dr. Robert H. Lord of Harvard treated of the Winning of the Amur, one of the principal achievements of Russian diplomacy and a landmark in the history of Russian expansion. The process of acquisition was begun by General Nicholas Muraviev, who became governor-general in 1847 and at once perceived the vast importance to Russia of the possession of the region. Despite the protests of China and the timidity of St. Petersburg, in a few years Russia was in actual possession, and in 1858, by virtue of the conditions due to the Taiping rebellion and the Anglo-French war with China, Muraviev obtained a treaty confirming the possession. But the Chinese government repudiated the treaty, and it became the task of General Nicholas Ignatiev, who was sent to China in the spring of 1859, to obtain a definitive ratification of the cession. During some months Ignatiev was unsuccessful; then, the Anglo-French expedition to Peking gave him his opportunity. By insinuating himself into the confidence of the French and British representatives and utilizing the helplessness of the Chinese and working especially upon their fears, he was able practically to formulate the agreement concluded between the Chinese and the allies, and then to obtain for Russia even more than had hitherto been demanded—including acclamations of gratitude from his victims.

The paper by Professor Samuel N. Harper of Chicago, on the "Russian Nationalists", or government party in the Duma, traced the origin of that party back to the official nationalism—"Russia for the Russians"—which existed in autocratic Russia at the end of the nineteenth century, and was itself an outgrowth of Slavophilism. He showed how those representing this variety of opinion, though numerically weak, had been able to acquire power through the reaction against the movements of 1905, and to throw discredit on the non-Russian nationalities of the Empire. He described the legislative restrictions upon Poles, Finns, and other non-Russian elements, which had flowed from this spirit of exclusive nationalism, and the constant protests of the Liberals against it as essentially foreign to the Russian genius.

In American history, one of the most notable papers, surely, was that in which Professor Frederick J. Turner of Harvard analyzed in various fields the Significance of Sectionalism in American His-

tory. This we hope to have the pleasure of presenting to our readers before long.

A regional matter of much interest was discussed in the joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association by Professor Royal B. Way of Northwestern University. His paper on English Relations in the Northwest, 1789–1794, took issue with that on the Western Posts and the British Debts which Professor McLaughlin contributed to the proceedings of 1894. The writer believed that British conduct in that period was more open to criticism. He held that the British officials continually deceived the Indians as to the provisions of the treaty of 1783 in respect to Indian lands in the Ohio valley, persisted in a policy of consolidation of Indian tribes for English advantage, extended their trade and established new posts, blocked peace between the Indians and the United States, and by timely supplies aided the Indian warfare.

Professor Max Farrand of Yale, in a paper entitled "One Hundred Years Ago", read in a session specially devoted to American history, described how, just after the War of 1812, there emerged a growing democracy, first becoming conscious of its power. The European wars and the resulting commercial legislation of the United States led to a national protective tariff system. Population moved rapidly westward, and easier communication between East and West became a necessity. There developed in the Middle West a conscious nationality and a national type, which began to express itself in a national literature. A change in religious thinking, greater tolerance, less attention to theological abstractions, mark the period. The effect of the invention of the cotton gin on slavery is a commonplace; the effect of slavery on cotton growing was just as important. But the greatest force at work in the creation of a nation was the development of an internal commerce, which brought with it a feeling of national completeness.

Dr. Henry B. Learned's account of Cabinet Meetings under Polk was based largely on Polk's *Diary,* which reveals glimpses of nearly four hundred sessions, held twice a week with remarkable regularity. They probably mark the beginnings of a custom of regular meetings now well established. After commenting briefly on the appointments to the Cabinet, the author dwelt on various practices, such as votes in cabinet, the presentation of written opinions, and the question of admitting outsiders to its sessions. He called attention to the evidence of aid rendered by the advisers (and others) in the matter of preparation of the four annual messages; to the Cabinet's attitude toward the quarrel between Trist

and Scott; to the effort to give Benton the highest military command; and to Polk's practice as to accepting the advice of his regular counsellors, or acting independently of it.

Professor St. George L. Sioussat of Vanderbilt University, in a paper on Tennessee and National Political Parties, 1850–1860, analyzed the relations of the Whig and Democratic parties in Tennessee in the compromise of 1850 and the secession movement of 1849–1851, and devoted special attention to the Nashville convention of 1850. In 1851 the Whigs carried the state by reason of the rivalry in the democratic organization between Aaron V. Brown and A. O. P. Nicholson, of whom Brown gradually drew toward the more extreme Southern position, while Nicholson upheld the compromise of 1850. But the national organization of the Whigs soon went to pieces, though Scott received the electoral vote of Tennessee. From these Whig victories of 1851 and 1853, Tennessee was redeemed by Andrew Johnson of East Tennessee, a man of very different type from the Middle Tennessee leaders. The paper closed with a rapid survey of the politics of Tennessee to 1860, with Andrew Johnson as the central figure.

In the joint session held with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, an interesting feature was a discussion of the origin of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. It was opened by a paper by Professor F. H. Hodder entitled "When the Railroads Came to Chicago". After making a plea for the study of early railroads, the paper traced Stephen A. Douglas's interest in them. In 1836 he made the first move toward the building of railroads in Illinois. In 1845 he proposed a railroad from Chicago to the Pacific. In 1850, by an alliance with the South, he secured the first grant to the states for railroad purposes and at the same time provided a branch road to Chicago. He continuously supported bills to grant land to Iowa, Missouri, and Arkansas for the construction of railroads to connect with proposed Pacific railroads and in the same connection proposed the organization of the western territory. It is reasonable to suppose that he organized Kansas and Nebraska in 1854 for the purpose for which he had urged organization since 1845.

Professor P. Orman Ray of Trinity College, Hartford, in replying to Professor Hodder, contended that the Kansas-Nebraska Act originated in western, particularly Missouri, conditions and in so far as it can be ascribed to any one man was due to the influence of Senator Atchison, rather than to that of Douglas. Any theory of the genesis of the act must explain why it was passed in this

particular year, 1854, and why the provision respecting the Missouri Compromise was added. The answer to both these questions is to be found in the history of the schism in the Democratic party in Missouri, which culminated in the senatorial fight of 1853–1854. He ascribed to Professor Hodder's theory a tendency to attach to certain events an importance out of proportion to that felt by contemporaries, an excessive reliance on the pages of the *Congressional Globe,* and the ignoring of some evidence which conflicted with his view.

In the discussion which followed Professor James A. Woodburn of Indiana University spoke of the fact that other features of the bill had been neglected because of the importance of the repealing section. Mrs. Mathews of the University of Wisconsin expressed the feeling that Professor Ray was emphasizing actual authorship of the bill, Professor Hodder its genesis; agrarian interests played a part also. Professor Sioussat maintained that southern railroad interests likewise had an influence in the history of the bill.

In a valuable and suggestive paper on the Agrarian History of the United States as a Subject for Research, Professor William J. Trimble of the North Dakota Agricultural College took broad ground for the study, not of the technical development of agriculture alone, but of agricultural history in its relation to the whole circle of economic and social history. He laid just emphasis upon its importance. The leading occupation of the American people has been agriculture, yet the history of our agriculture has received little attention. With the rise of scientific agriculture, however, a distinct demand for agrarian history is arising. Agricultural economists in particular insist that such history is indispensable. Questions of agricultural statesmanship, which go to the heart of our country's life, need urgently the light of agrarian history. Yet scarcely more than a beginning has been made. Information is inadequate and often derived from interested sources. A long process of development is needed and the systematic co-operation of many workers. The work can be done only by real historians, having sympathetic understanding of agriculture and rural problems.

It remains to chronicle the conference of historical societies and the conference of archivists. Both of these were marked by real discussion, which had been conspicuously absent from the other sessions of the association.

The former conference was opened with a paper by the chairman, Dr. Otto L. Schmidt, on the Chicago Historical Society, its history, its present activities, and its plans for future work. Dr.

Dunbar Rowland, chairman of the conference's committee on the co-operation of historical societies and departments, reported that the work of calendaring the documents in the French archives concerning the history of the Mississippi Valley, a work which had been going on in Paris under the direction of Mr. Waldo G. Leland, was nearly completed, and would have been entirely finished but for the outbreak of war in Europe.

Professor James A. Woodburn of Indiana University read a paper on Research in State History at State Universities. He held that the state could properly endow and employ its university for the promotion of the study of its history, and favored especially such activities as the collection and publication of materials, the establishment of scholarships, of research fellowships, or of historical commissions of survey to co-operate with the state historical society. Professor Eugene C. Barker of Texas pointed out the important part which the work of the graduate student might have in such endeavors, Professor Orin G. Libby of North Dakota the value they might incidentally have in bringing university men into contact with the larger community. Professor Clarence W. Alvord of Illinois suggested a division of functions between the historical society and the university, whereby the former might devote itself to the publication of materials, the latter of monographs.

A second discussion grew out of a paper by Mr. Lawrence J. Burpee of the Ottawa Public Library on Restrictions upon Use of Historical Materials. Those who took part in the discussion were Dr. George N. Fuller of Michigan, Dr. Milo M. Quaife of Wisconsin, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits of the New York Public Library, Professor Alvord of Illinois, and the secretary of the conference, Dr. Solon J. Buck of the Minnesota Historical Society. The prevailing opinion was in favor of the greatest possible liberality. Dr. Quaife spoke of the inexpediency of lending manuscripts, Mr. Paltsits of the allowable distinctions in treatment, between archival materials and historical papers of private origin.

The conference of archivists, eminently helpful and practical, was attended by about fifty persons. The chairman, Mr. Paltsits, presented a summary report of the Public Archives Commission for 1914. More than two hours were devoted to the consideration of practical problems of archival economy. President Charles H. Rammelkamp of Illinois College, in a paper on Legislation for Archives, dealt with the fundamental laws that are necessary for the archivist and for the preservation of archives, and reviewed legislation enacted in the various states since 1901. A discussion

followed, by Mr. George S. Godard of Connecticut, Professor Harlow Lindley of Indiana, Mr. Ernest W. Winkler of Texas, Mr. James I. Wyer, jr., of New York, Mr. Edgar R. Harlan of Iowa, Mr. Leland, and the chairman. A practical paper, illustrated by diagrams, on the Principles of Classification for Archives, was presented by Miss Ethel B. Virtue, of the Historical Department of Iowa. She upheld the principle of origin, with *respect des fonds,* and demonstrated its application in the classification of the archives of Iowa. This subject was discussed by Mr. Lindley, Mr. Godard, and others, with a virtual unanimity for the system propounded. Mr. Leland spoke informally on Cataloguing of Archives, defining the different kinds of catalogues that should obtain. He distinguished sharply between historical manuscripts and archives, and pointed out that rules for cataloguing the former do not apply to the latter; and also showed the differences between catalogues for official purposes and those for historical purposes, the former varying greatly according to the material, the latter best consisting in a succession of catalogues, beginning with the check-list or *état sommaire,* continuing in the more detailed descriptive catalogue or *inventaire analytique,* and culminating in the calendar.

The annual business meeting, presided over by Professor McLaughlin as president of the Association, began as usual with the report of the secretary, Mr. Leland. He reported a total membership of 2913. The treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen (treasurer from the first day of the Association's existence), reported net disbursements of $10,481, as against net receipts of $9,969. The total assets of the Association were $26,797, a slight loss in comparison with the preceding year. The report of the Executive Council, presented by its new secretary, Professor Evarts B. Greene, included five recommendations, all of which were adopted by the Association. It recommended that the annual meeting of December, 1916, be held in Cincinnati; that of December, 1915, the Association had already voted to hold in Washington. In deference to recent criticism of the Association's machinery and practices, the Council recommended that a committee of nine be appointed "to consider the constitution, organization, and procedure of the Association, with instructions to report to the annual meeting of 1915", and that a consideration of the relations between the Association and the American Historical Review be included in that committee's functions. In response to requests from various organizations of teachers, it recommended that a standing Committee on History in Schools be instituted, to consider questions which have arisen or

may arise in that field, and to replace the present Committee on the Preparation of Teachers of History in Schools. The three-years' grant to the *History Teacher's Magazine* having expired, it recommended that an appropriation of $400 per annum for two years be made to that journal, conditional upon the raising of an additional guaranty fund of $600 per annum, the arrangement between the journal and the Association in other respects continuing as adjusted in December, 1911. Finally, the Council recommended, and the Association adopted, the following rule respecting the non-payment of dues:

"The annual dues for the ensuing twelve months are due on September 1. Publications [including the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW] will not be sent to members whose dues remain unpaid after October 15. Members whose dues remain unpaid on March 1 shall be dropped from the roll of the Association."

The budget for 1915 was also presented. The Council announced the re-election of Professor James H. Robinson as a member of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, he being the member whose term of six years expired at the end of the year 1914, and of Professor Carl L. Becker to fill the unexpired term of Professor McLaughlin, who resigned his membership of the Board.

The report of the Pacific Coast Branch was offered by Professor H. Morse Stephens, of the University of California, who outlined the attractive programme he had constructed for the special meeting to be held by the Association on July 21, 22, and 23, 1915, at San Francisco, Berkeley, and Palo Alto. Brief reports were presented on behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, the chairman of which, Mr. Worthington C. Ford, now resigns that position, and on behalf of the Public Archives Commission by its chairman, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits. A report from the Board of Editors of this journal was presented by Professor Edward P. Cheyney; a report from the Advisory Board of the *History Teacher's Magazine* was read. The Committee on Publications, Professor Farrand, chairman, reported especially as to the series of prize essays, independently published, which has nearly reached the point where it can sustain itself, the sales of the first three books having now run up to more than 500 copies each, while those of the last three amount already to considerably more than 300 each. For the committee on bibliography, its chairman, Dr. Ernest C. Richardson, reported marked progress by a sub-committee on the proposed bibliography of American travels, and the adoption by the Library

of Congress of the proposed joint finding-list of sets of historical periodicals in American libraries. Professor Cheyney, for the committee on a bibliography of modern English history, in course of preparation by two committees, British and American, was obliged to report that the war had compelled a suspension of activity on the part of the British committee. Reports were also made by the general editor of the series of *Original Narratives of Early American History,* by the general committee through its chairman, Professor Frederic L. Paxson, and by the chairman of the committee on the Justin Winsor Prize, Professor Claude H. Van Tyne. The prize was awarded to Miss Mary Wilhelmine Williams, formerly of Stanford University, for an essay entitled "Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815–1914", which will take its place as the ninth volume in the Association's series, next after that of Miss Barbour on the Earl of Arlington. Informal reports had been made from certain other committees, and the series ended with the report of the committee on nominations, presented in print.[1]

Perhaps the reviewing of this impressive array of historical business, for which the Association mainly exists, lent sobriety to the discussion which ensued upon the less essential matters of officers and nominations, organization and methods. Probably, too, the submission to the members, on arrival, of printed minutes of the Council's preparatory meeting of November 28, and the subsequent supplying of similar records of Council action at Chicago, enabled members to feel that all Association matters were duly under their review and control. At all events, the discussion was carried on with the utmost good-nature and without any manifestation of feeling. During the year there had been not a little discussion among members, in print, in letters, and in conversation, as to the extent of the dissatisfaction said to prevail in respect to the existing methods of nomination and management.[2] It cannot be said that the proceedings at Chicago cast any clear light upon this question.

[1] A few copies of this report, and a few copies of the Council minutes mentioned in the next paragraph, and including an abridgment of the treasurer's report and the budget, can still be obtained from the secretary of the Association.

[2] Under the title, *The Government of the American Historical Association: a Plea for a Return to the Constitution,* Dr. Dunbar Rowland sent out to the members in December a pamphlet containing letters reprinted from the *Nation,* and charging, under thirteen particulars, an unconstitutional control of the Association by the Council. The charges numbered I., VI., VII., VIII., IX., and XIII. relate to points of constitutional law; as to these, since Dr. Rowland reprints the constitution, each reader can judge for himself whether that document, plus the acquiescence of the Association, has warranted the actions mentioned. But it is worth while to state explicitly, for the benefit of members who do not attend meetings, that what are charged under II., III., V., and XII. have not been actions of the Council, that what is mentioned under IV. was fully authorized by the Association, and that there is no foundation in fact for the charges numbered X. and XI.

To the specific inquiry sent out to members, in the circular from this year's committee on nominations, whether the member thought that a substantial change should be made in the method of nominating officers, it is reported by the committee that only 49 out of 182 replies were in the affirmative. Probably whatever dissatisfaction existed was much reduced by the obvious desire of the Council to place itself at the disposal of the Association. No other attitude is proper, and no other was suggested in the November meeting of the Council, in which the recommendation of a revisionary Committee of Nine was voted unanimously. When that proposal was under consideration by the Association, Dr. Dunbar Rowland made an alternative motion for a committee of thirteen, with powers somewhat more widely stated; but the Council's recommendation was preferred, by a vote of 88 to 31. A committee formed on the spot reported at an adjourned session the next morning the nine names: Messrs. E. D. Adams, Connor, Cox, Dunning, Farrand, McLaughlin, Rhodes, Root, and Sullivan. Mr. McLaughlin has since been chosen chairman; Mr. Rhodes has declined to serve upon the committee.

The reference of so many of the Association's affairs to this new committee ought not to obscure the good work done by the committee of nominations, Professor Charles H. Hull chairman, whose printed report has already been mentioned. To the ordinary functions of such a committee the Charleston meeting had added that of formulating "a plan by which the general opinion of the Association on nominations might be more fully elicited". This difficult task the committee had assailed in a most thorough and thoughtful manner, seeking light from the members of the Association and from the experience of similar bodies. The plan which it proposed was that a nominating committee should be chosen a year in advance, not by the Council but by the business meeting; that it should, perhaps when the September bills go out, invite every member to express his preference as to officers; that the committee's nominations be published in advance, perhaps by printing them in the programme; and that the committee prepare, for distribution to attending members, upon their registering at the meeting, a printed ballot, which, in addition to the committee's nominations, should contain such other names as may be proposed, in writing, to the chairman of the committee, by twenty or more members, and should also provide, under each office, a blank space for voting upon such further nominations as may be individually presented on the floor of the business meeting.

The plan thus proposed was adopted for trial in 1915, and the Association appointed a nominating committee of five, whose names appear in the lists at the end of this article, the chairman being Professor Charles H. McIlwain of Harvard.

The committee for 1914 (Professor Hull's committee) nominated, and the Association by ballot elected, the following officers for the ensuing year: president, H. Morse Stephens; first vice-president, George L. Burr; second vice-president, Worthington C. Ford; secretary, Waldo G. Leland; secretary to the council, Evarts B. Greene; treasurer, Clarence W. Bowen; curator, A. Howard Clark. To the six elective memberships in the Council, they elected John M. Vincent, Frederic Bancroft, and Charles H. Haskins (these three by re-election), Eugene C. Barker, Guy S. Ford, and Ulrich B. Phillips. The committees appointed according to custom by the Council are named in the lists at the conclusion of the present article.

Since the terms in which the Committee of Nine received its mandate include a consideration of possible alterations in the relations between the Association and this journal, it is well to state what those relations now are. The REVIEW was brought into existence by a conference of some thirty or forty interested persons, held in April, 1895. These elected the first Board of Editors, who made with the Macmillan Company the contract under which publication still takes place. An association of guarantors was formed, with guaranties running three years. The first number appeared in October, 1895. The association of guarantors confirmed the election of editors, and arranged for six-year terms, one member to be elected each year. Shortly before the expiration of the three years, the Association, which up to that time had had no connection with the REVIEW, made a subvention to it, upon terms which at the New Haven meeting of December, 1898, were amplified into a formal agreement. At that time the REVIEW had about 800 subscribers who were members of the Association, and about 800 who were not; the number of the latter is now about 260. The terms of the agreement were that the successive numbers of the REVIEW should be sent, at a special rate, to all members of the Association, and that the Executive Council of the Association should elect members of the Board of Editors as their terms expired or as vacancies occurred.

The relations thus defined have continued to subsist ever since. The Association assumed no further responsibilities. The editors are responsible for the finances of the journal, and are the con-

tracting party with its publishers. Legally no doubt they are its owners; but this has no practical importance whatever, for the only conceivable course for them to follow is to administer it as virtual trustees for its readers and subscribers and for the whole historical profession in America, or, if one chooses, for the American Historical Association in so far as that body is the constituted representative of such interests. The writer of these pages, though abundantly conscious of the journal's imperfections, believes that it has been managed with a single eye to the interests of its readers and of the historical profession. If under some different constitution it can serve those interests better, he does not expect to see the Board of Editors resisting the amendment.

J. F. J.

Officers and Committees of the American Historical Association

President,	Professor H. Morse Stephens, Berkeley, Cal.
First Vice-President,	Professor George L. Burr, Ithaca.
Second Vice-President,	Worthington C. Ford, Boston.
Secretary,	Waldo G. Leland, Carnegie Institution, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.
Treasurer,	Clarence W. Bowen of New York (address 1140 Woodward Building, Washington).
Secretary to the Council,	Professor Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.
Curator,	A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution.

Executive Council (in addition to the above-named officers):

Hon. Andrew D. White,[1]
President James B. Angell,[1]
Henry Adams,[1]
James Schouler,[1]
James Ford Rhodes,[1]
Professor John B. McMaster,[1]
Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin,[1]
J. Franklin Jameson,[1]
Professor George B. Adams,[1]
Professor Albert Bushnell Hart,[1]
Professor Frederick J. Turner,[1]
Professor William M. Sloane,[1]
Colonel Theodore Roosevelt,[1]
Professor William A. Dunning,[1]
Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin,[1]
Professor John M. Vincent,
Frederic Bancroft,
Professor Charles H. Haskins,
Professor Eugene C. Barker,
Professor Guy S. Ford,
Professor Ulrich B. Phillips.

[1] Ex-presidents.

Committees:

Committee on Programme for the Thirty-first Annual Meeting: Professor Charles D. Hazen, chairman; James F. Baldwin, John S. Bassett, Carl F. Huth, jr., Robert M. Johnston, John H. Latané, Henry B. Learned, Miss Ruth Putnam.

Committee on Local Arrangements: Herbert Putnam, chairman; Frederic Bancroft, Miss Frances G. Davenport, Mrs. John W. Foster, John B. Henderson, David J. Hill, Henry B. Learned, Waldo G. Leland, Miss Ruth Putnam.

Committee on Programme, Special Meeting, San Francisco, July 21–23, 1915: Professor Frederic L. Thompson, chairman; Eugene C. Barker, Herbert E. Bolton, Max Farrand, Joseph Schafer, Arley B. Show, Frederick J. Teggart, Payson J. Treat, James F. Willard.

Committee on Nominations: Professor Charles H. McIlwain, Harvard University; Mrs. Lois K. Mathews, University of Wisconsin; Edmond S. Meany, University of Washington; Charles H. Rammelkamp, Illinois College; Alfred H. Stone, Dunleith, Miss.

Editors of the American Historical Review: Professor Edward P. Cheyney, chairman; Carl Becker, George L. Burr, J. Franklin Jameson, James H. Robinson, Frederick J. Turner.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Gaillard Hunt, Library of Congress, chairman; Charles H. Ambler, Herbert E. Bolton, Archer B. Hulbert, William O. Scroggs, Justin H. Smith.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Professor Carl R. Fish, University of Wisconsin, chairman; George L. Beer, Isaac J. Cox, Allen Johnson, Everett Kimball.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: Professor Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois, chairman; Sidney B. Fay, William R. Shepherd, Paul van Dyke, Albert B. White.

Public Archives Commission: Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Charles M. Andrews, Solon J. Buck, George S. Godard, Thomas M. Owen, Alexander S. Salley, Jr.

Committee on Bibliography: Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; Walter Lichtenstein, William W. Rockwell, William A. Slade, Bernard C. Steiner, Frederick J. Teggart.

Committee on Publications: Professor Max Farrand, Yale University, chairman; and (*ex officio*) Carl R. Fish, Evarts B. Greene, Gaillard Hunt, J. Franklin Jameson, Laurence M.

Larson, Waldo G. Leland, Victor H. Paltsits, Ernest C. Richardson.

General Committee: Professor William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Annie H. Abel, Arthur I. Andrews, William K. Boyd, James M. Callahan, Clarence E. Carter, Carlton H. Hayes, Waldo G. Leland, Robert M. McElroy, William A. Morris, Robert W. Neeser, Edmund S. Noyes, Louis Pelzer, Morgan P. Robinson, Nathaniel W. Stephenson, Eugene M. Violette, Clarance M. Warner.

Committee on a Bibliography of Modern English History: Professor Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Wilbur C. Abbott, Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Conyers Read.

Committee on History in Schools: Professor William S. Ferguson, Harvard University, chairman; Victoria Adams, Henry E. Bourne, Henry L. Cannon, Edgar Dawson, Oliver M. Dickerson, Herbert D. Foster, Samuel B. Harding, Margaret McGill, Robert A. Maurer, James Sullivan.

Conference of Historical Societies: Lyon G. Tyler, chairman; Augustus H. Shearer, secretary.

Advisory Board of the History Teacher's Magazine: Professor Henry Johnson, Teachers College, chairman (re-elected to serve three years); Fred M. Fling, George C. Sellery, St. George L. Sioussat, James Sullivan (these four hold over), Anna B. Thompson (elected to serve three years).

Committee on Military and Naval History: Professor Robert M. Johnston, Harvard University, chairman; Captain Arthur L. Conger, Fred M. Fling, Charles O. Paullin, Captain Oliver L. Spaulding.

Committee on the Military History Prize: Captain Arthur L. Conger, Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, chairman; Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Allen R. Boyd, Fred M. Fling, Albert Bushnell Hart.

Committee of Nine (see p. 523): Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago, chairman; Ephraim D. Adams, Robert D. W. Connor, Isaac J. Cox, William A. Dunning, Max Farrand, Winfred T. Root, James Sullivan, and one member to be elected by the committee.

BOYEN'S MILITARY LAW[1]

On April 18 I wrote the chairman of the programme committee that if it was the plan of this meeting to emphasize events of a century ago, I could think of nothing in 1814 of greater importance than Boyen's Law, establishing universal military service in Prussia. It was an historical judgment without trace of prophetic insight. The terrific events that have intervened, placing us not in memory alone, but in actuality also, back in the world-war conditions of 1814, have not modified that judgment, though they prevented the plans I then had for gathering material,[2] and made some of the

[1] A paper read in the conference on Napoleonic Europe at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, December 29, 1914.

[2] The bibliography of this subject treated against the background of military development in Prussia would be practically a bibliography of the history of Brandenburg-Prussia. The public activity in connection with the centennial of the era of reform and the Wars of Liberation makes the literature of even that brief period too considerable for inclusive reference. The following limited list to which, with other titles, specific reference is made on occasion, gives the essential material aside from histories of Brandenburg-Prussia and of the Prussian army. On the periodization of army organization and the Prussian army between 1640 and 1740 *cf.* Schmoller, *Umrisse und Untersuchungen zur Verfassungs-, Verwaltungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte,* etc. (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 247–288 (also in *Deutsche Rundschau,* 1877, pp. 248–273). On the Great Elector's army from the same point of view as Schmoller, *cf.* von Schroetter, *Die Brandenburgisch-Preussische Heeresverfassung unter dem Grossen Kurfürsten* (Leipzig, 1892, in Schmoller's *Staats- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen*). On Frederick I. and the army, see von Schroetter in *Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte,* XXIII. 403–467, and Hintze, *Historische und Politische Aufsätze,* vol. I. (Berlin, Deutsche Bücherei, 1908), and his essay on the Hohenzollerns and the nobility in *Historische Zeitschrift,* CXII. 494–524. On Frederick William I., *cf.* Lehmann in *Historische Zeitschrift,* LXVII. 254–289, and Hintze, *op. cit.* On Frederick the Great and the army *cf.* Koser, *König Friedrich der Grosse, passim,* esp. I. 538 ff., and von der Goltz, *Rossbach und Jena* (Berlin, 1883). On the subject of the paper and the military reforms of Scharnhorst it is sufficient to name the works without which it could not have been written. Two stand out, Lehmann, *Scharnhorst* (Leipzig, 1886, 1887, 2 vols.) and Meinecke's brilliant two volumes on *Das Leben des Generalfeldmarschalls Hermann von Boyen* (Stuttgart, 1895, 1899). To these should be added von Boyen's *Erinnerungen* (ed. Nippold, Leipzig, 1889–1890, 3 vols.), by all odds the best of the memoir literature of the reform era in Prussia. Unfortunately they break off just before 1814. Historical biographies such as those of Gneisenau by Pertz-Delbrück, Grolmann by Conrady, Stein by Lehmann need only to be mentioned. Cavaignac's *La Formation de la Prusse Contemporaine* (Paris, 1891, 1898, 2 vols.) is an excellent synthetic treatment of the years 1806–1813, but not to be compared in insight or suggestiveness to F. Meinecke's little volume *Das Zeitalter der Deutschen Erhebung, 1795–1815* (Bielefeld, 1906). Further titles relating to the period and the subject of military history may be found in Dahlmann-Waitz (eighth ed.), no. 2408 *et seq.* and no.

views I held essential to its proper understanding into the commonplaces of current misinformation.· Nevertheless, I have not changed the subject nor the view expressed last April of its importance.

The subject of military service takes us at once into the heart of the history of Brandenburg-Prussia. As one reads it, the rustle of its pages sounds like the rattle of swords in their scabbards. Its seemingly tortuous course has one straight red line that leads from battle-field to battle-field. Its paragraph headings are the names of wars. Its heroes are embattled soldiers and sovereigns. Its greatest statesman thought in terms of regiments and wrote his politics with blood and iron. Its epochs are but periods of military greatness and decline. In its history, Ascanians give way to Hohenzollerns, crusading Teutonic Knights pass from the stage, but the essential interest in the history of these two German military frontier colonies—islands in a Slavic ocean—remains the same, whether separate or united. Situated in the vast sand-strewn plains of North Germany, beyond the Elbe, Brandenburg-Prussia, with no frontiers but the movable ones of marching armies, with no neighbors who were not jealous enemies, was characterized by Mirabeau a century before Treitschke and his school, as a nation whose "chief industry is war", and the motto which best epitomizes the lessons of its history is the war-wise phrase of Frederick the Great, *Toujours en vedette*. What I have here suggested in a paragraph finds its clearest expression not in the works of Prussian historians, but in a single essay by a Frenchman[3] who has revealed to Prussians the foundations of their nation's military greatness as Mahan taught the significance of English naval history to Englishmen.

Bound up as the development of the army was with the development of the state in Brandenburg-Prussia, the organization and composition of this army were none the less influenced by the historical changes taking place everywhere in military matters since the Middle Ages. In general four stages may be distinguished. There is first the feudal army whose obligations, in form at least, still obtained in the eighteenth century and whose spirit was not wholly broken in the nineteenth. Then came what may be called the guild army, the professional warriors who recruited their apprentices

12292 *et seq.* Two recent works to which I have not had access are Kalkoff, *Die Vorgeschichte der Allgemeinen Wehrpflicht in Preussen* (Breslau, 1913) and von der Goltz, *Kriegsgeschichte Deutschlands im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1914).

[3] Lavisse, *Études sur l'Histoire de la Prusse* (fourth ed., Paris, 1896), *cf.* esp. pp. 65 ff. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, I. 463 ff., follows Lavisse.

where they would and, through their masters the company and regimental officers, contracted their services where they could. From Marignano in 1516 to Breitenstein in 1631 may be said to mark roughly the period of what Bernard Shaw would revive, war by labor union armies. Over against the horrors of the Thirty Years' War conducted by brutalized, denationalized professional soldiers, the student of military history may set two indications of a new epoch—the sectarian nationalism of Gustavus Adolphus's army and the dynastic nationalism of the small standing army preserved at every cost by Frederick William the Great Elector.

What the Great Elector seized upon was the central idea, that the economic and political independence and integrity of his state depended upon an army.[4] That army could not with his limited resources be wholly a contract army, nor was it politically sound to have an army which might shift its allegiance at any time—which indeed, like modern domestic servants, had no allegiance and no permanent connection with the state. What he secured was permanence of service—fixing the army in its attachment to one land and in its subordination to one commander, the Elector himself. They might be and were recruited, as in the preceding century, by force and fraud from all lands. The native element predominated under the Great Elector *from necessity* as the exhaustion of neighboring lands made them poor recruiting grounds, except among the most degraded classes, but their colonels at least, he appointed and assigned to their regiments, and the soldiers, over and above the terms of their contract with the recruiting officer, owed obedience to the monarch. He alone henceforth, and not cities and estates, was to enlist and pay troops. To pay these troops and maintain them as the instruments of his sovereign will, he must subordinate provincial estates, break up local and municipal autonomy, control and reshape the fiscal system, devise an administrative system and train a bureaucracy, which like the army read its articles of war in the decreed will of the sovereign. The military necessities of the Great Elector's system, as in all the past of the state of Brandenburg-Prussia, put their stamp upon everything else and covered all readjustments, however violent, with the mantle of victory. The battle of Warsaw in 1656 and more distinctly the triumph at Fehrbellin in 1675 justified, as only battles can, the new army and its creator.

With the introduction of the element of the permanent standing army by the Great Elector we pass into the third period in military history since the early Middle Ages, that in which the army has been

[4] Schmoller, *Umrisse und Untersuchungen*, pp. 261 ff.

secularized. It becomes now the property and instrument of the state, in the sense in which the first three Hohenzollern kings and the enlightened despotism of the eighteenth century conceived the state. Its supreme development is the work of Frederick William I., between 1713 and 1740—its supreme test and justification, the work of Frederick II. Nor should the student of military development pass over the years 1688–1713,[5] years in which the great wars of Louis XIV. so overstrained the old methods of recruiting that the first idea of a broader basis for military service is recognized by Louvois in France, by Frederick I. of Prussia, and by the English, who in the Bill of Rights had attempted to put behind them the idea of a standing army.

The central figure in the work of secularizing the army is Frederick William I. He swept away the last remnants of feudal obligations and stamped out ruthlessly the slight beginnings of a militia-system. Nothing but the professional soldier wearing the king's uniform and drilled even under his own command satisfied him. Before the necessities of such a state corporealized in sovereign and army the provincial estates faded to shadows. Army and fiscal administration became but two sides of the shield. Yet the "canton system", limited service, and the first proclamation of the idea of universal military service—epoch-making as they were—founded and developed under Frederick William I. and his son, not a national army, but a magnificent dynastic political instrument whose reflected glories kindled once for all a pride of Prussian citizenship from the Memel to the Rhine. But it was a citizenship without common rights—a service based upon class divisions. The noble had come to have almost exclusive claim upon the officers' positions in the army and the high places in diplomacy. He had been gradually forced into the king's livery[6] and now his reward was social and economic and political privilege on every hand. His preservation as a class was carefully guarded. In the central and eastern part of the kingdom he ruled as a sovereign over the servile subjects on his domains. They in turn were protected and preserved as a class inasmuch as the burden of filling the ranks of the army to supplement foreign enlistment fell upon them alone. The cities were walled off from the land by the economic and fiscal system and by almost complete exemption from enlistment, in return for bearing the burdens of a taxation system designed chiefly to meet military expenditures. The army, two-thirds of which might be recruited from abroad, from

[5] Von Schroetter in *Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte*, XXIII. 403–467, also pp. 82 ff.

[6] *Cf.* Hintze in *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXII. 494–524.

deserters, and from prisoners of war, was held in line by a harsh and brutalizing discipline. It was indeed "the proletariat of the eighteenth century". Its relation to the national life is reflected in Frederick's boast that with it he could carry on a war while Prussian merchant and manufacturer went unknowing and undisturbed about his business. The fervor of such an army for the cause in which it was engaged may be judged by the careful regulations against marching it through a wood or camping near one in order to avoid opportunities for desertion.

The twenty years from the death of Frederick the Great to the battle of Jena have never enjoyed the attention of the historians of Prussia.[7] They probably never will. Yet within the decaying framework of the old was maturing the greatest product of a passing age, the seeds of a new order. Stein in Westphalia and Hardenberg in Franconia were developing as did Turgot in Limousin the principles of a better government and the administrative initiative that could secure it. Behind his desk as a lecturer in the military school, Scharnhorst was training a new school of Prussian militarists. In the ranks of the army, men like Gneisenau, Boyen, and Grolmann were restlessly waiting an opportunity to make the Frederickian army into an organization that would embody the best of the old and something of the new. So many are the voices that advocated change and readjustment that a later age might almost see in the feeble efforts of those two decades a promise of reform without the necessity of a national disaster.[8] It is a misreading of history. Nothing short of Jena and the shameful days that followed the collapse of the Frederickian military system could have chastened the spirit of class and provincial interest in the old Prussia or wrung from the hesitating Frederick William III. decisions that voiced the Calvinism of Kant's categorical imperative. The new religion of the state preached by the reform party was not that of the eighteenth-century enlightened despots, but the central idea of the Königsberg philosopher, the harmony of humanity in the service of the nation. What the reformers demanded was for Prussia a revaluation of values profounder than any conceived by Nietzsche for the nineteenth century. Nowhere was the fundamental idea more clearly stated than by two members of the military reorganization committee:

[7] Philippsohn, *Geschichte des Preussischen Staatswesens* (Leipzig, 1880, 1882) stops at 1797 and the best account is now to be found in Heigel, *Deutsche Geschichte vom Tode Friedrichs des Grossen bis zur Auflösung des Alten Reichs* (Stuttgart, 1899–1911).

[8] O. Hintze, "Preussische Reformbestrebungen vor 1806" in *Historische Zeitschrift*, vol. LXXVI. Also in his *Historische und Politische Aufsätze*, vol. III. Hintze does not fall into the error pointed out above.

If it were possible after a series of privations, after boundless sufferings, to raise ourselves from ruin, who would not sacrifice everything in order to plant the seeds of a new fruit? Who would not gladly die if he might hope that they would spring up with new power and new life? But in ony one way is this possible. The nation must be imbued with self-reliance, it must have an opportunity to know itself and to stand by and for itself. Then and then only will it have self-respect and inspire respect in others. To work toward this end is all that we can do. To destroy the old forms, to burst the bonds of prejudice, to bring the new birth, cherish it and see that nothing fetters or hinders its growth—more than this does not lie within the limits of our powers.

These are the words of Scharnhorst, the Hanoverian, after Tilsit. Gneisenau, the Saxon, voices the same sentiment in phrases that sound a note not heard from the officers of the great Frederick:

One cause in particular has raised France to this pitch of greatness; the revolution has awakened all powers and given each power a suitable field of activity. What infinite possibilities sleep in the womb of the nation undeveloped and unused! In the breast of thousands and thousands of men dwells a mighty genius whose soaring pinions are fettered by his surroundings. Why do not the reigning dynasties (*Höfe*) adopt the surest and simple means of opening a career to genius, of encouraging talents and virtues wherever they may be found in whatever class or rank? Why do they not adopt this means to increase their strength a thousandfold and open to the ordinary citizen the gates of triumph through which the noble alone may now pass? The new age needs more than old names, old titles and old parchments—it needs new deeds and fresh power! . . .[9]

Prepared by its past, compelled by the necessities of its present, and impressed by the lessons of the success of the revolutionary movements, Prussia was ready to enter upon the fourth stage in the composition and development of its army—the establishment of a national army.

In the era of Prussian regeneration between 1806 and 1813 nothing is more important for the history of the nineteenth century than the work of the military commission presided over by Scharnhorst. For him whom many a contemporary called a pedant in uniform the German historians have reserved the predicate of great. Without the authority of an all-powerful minister of war, without the support of a strong sovereign, in a state whose resources and territory were but a fragment of its former strength, amid the opposition of the old order to a theorist, a foreigner, and a radical, under the eyes of a suspicious and watchful enemy, Scharnhorst carried through the great task of rebuilding the Prussian monarchy and state upon the military foundations of the past; foundations, which he widened and deepened so that they were to be no longer dynastic

[9] Quoted by Lehmann, *Scharnhorst*, II. 15–16.

and feudal, but national and liberal. "Faire une armée c'est presque faire une nation."

The work of Scharnhorst, supported by all the vigor of Stein and assisted by Gneisenau and Grolmann and later by Boyen and Götzen, is familiar to students of Prussian history, but its main features and leading ideas may, indeed must, be recalled here, for Boyen's military law was but the completion of Scharnhorst's work. The singular importance and the soundness of this work are perhaps attested by no other thing so much as its continuation after Scharnhorst was gone.

Among the principal fields of activity on the part of the commission on reorganization appointed on July 27, 1807, there was first the task of punishing those officers who in the field or in fortresses had failed in their duty in 1806. Of the 143 generals in service in 1806 only two had commands in 1813.

Then came the more serious work of reconstruction. The possibility of attaining the rank of officer was opened to all classes having the necessary talent or preparation. The schools for officers were renewed and increased in number. Salaries were to be higher and chances for making money out of the management of the commissariat were cut off.

The common soldier was to be a citizen and treated humanely. Enlistment of foreigners was to cease. The principle of universal military service, written into the reports by Scharnhorst, could not be carried out then,[10] but exemptions which under the "canton system" had risen to include whole classes and areas were much reduced and the *Krümpersystem* enabled Prussia with an army limited to 42,000 to put 270,000 into the field in 1813.

The new type of officer and the new type of soldier permitted a revision of tactics and strategy in conformity with the practices developed by the revolutionary and Napoleonic armies.

It is not, however, with the details, but with the significance of the military aspect of the regeneration of Prussia that we are here concerned. Place measures of the military reorganization commission side by side with the edict of October 9, 1807, and the unity and the spirit of the age stand revealed. The work of Stein and Scharnhorst is one. They supplement and necessitate each other as parts of a great effort to liberalize and nationalize the Prussian state and army. Could the edict of Stein of October break down class barriers by enabling the nobles to enter business, by allowing the burgher class to buy noble lands, and yet leave an army in which

[10] *Cf.* especially efforts in 1809 to secure the king's approval. Lehmann in *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXI. 97–109.

the nobles alone had exclusive right to officers' positions? Could the feudal lord as an officer be forbidden to beat the peasantry when in the ranks as soldiers if he were in civil life on his estates still allowed to treat them as serfs subjected to degrading punishments? Could the territorial class element in military service and the restraints on entering trades under the "canton system" be maintained and the freedom of movement from country to city or into other "canton-free" areas and trades be permitted? Could the enlistment of foreigners be abolished and the whole burden of defense thrown on the nation with the short-term service of the *Krümpersystem* without, at the same time, doing everything to increase the recruit's intelligence and sense of oneness with the interests of the state he served? If the standing army was to be maintained and the professional military spirit in its best sense preserved in a land unfavored by nature, must not the national resources and the wealth-producing classes be freed from the hampering restrictions and class prejudices of a feudalistic state?[11] The answer is evident in view of Prussia's past history. The army could not be remade without remaking the social and political structure upon which the old military régime was based. Citizenship in a national army could not abide side by side with serfdom and class privilege in civil life. If the prophet by the waters of Chebar whose spirit Fichte invoked was to bring together the dead bones of the Prussian state he must breathe into the whole framework the breath of a new life.

The full evidence of the existence of the new spirit came in the Wars of Liberation, when the tide of national feeling swept away the remnants of the opposition, which had hampered Scharnhorst in carrying through his plan for universal military service. He was able to place in the field an army as national as the earlier revolutionary armies of France. It proved its worth against the dynastic, cosmopolitan, and conscript force with which Napoleon had replaced the earlier levies of the Revolution.

The military triumphs of this new Prussian army made the year 1814 exceptionally favorable for fixing in permanence the work which had begun in the era of reform. It was fitting that the framing of such a specifically Prussian piece of legislation as a decree introducing universal military service bears not the name of Stein, the Imperial Knight, nor of Hardenberg or Scharnhorst, the Hanoverians, nor Gneisenau, the Saxon, nor Blücher the Mecklenburger, but of Hermann von Boyen of East Prussia—a product of the Frederickian army who still idealized its creator, a pupil of

[11] Lehmann, *Scharnhorst*, II. 87 ff.

Kant and Kraus at Königsberg, an associate and trusted lieutenant of Scharnhorst throughout the era of reform and regeneration—a member of the Tugendbund.[12] A happier choice could not have been made than the appointment on June 3, 1814, of von Boyen as Prussia's first real minister of war, entrusted with the task of securing for Prussia the first of Gneisenau's trilogy—the primacy in military fame.

The work which Boyen now undertook to complete was the work of the era of Stein and Scharnhorst. In the minister Hardenberg he had a sympathetic chief and in Gneisenau, Grolmann, and Natzmer, men of his own selection, able and like-minded coadjutors. The reorganization of the war department and the general staff and the appointment to the pivotal positions of men who had worked with Scharnhorst, brought into the officer corps a breath of initiative and freedom and cleared the way for the fundamental reorganization of the army itself.

Boyen had drafted his main ideas on the new army by the end of July and a memoir prepared by him and Grolmann dated August 24, 1814, embodies the essentials of the new law.[13] It was a remarkably tactful presentation of the new in the guise of the old, a skillful concealment of the new burdens in the forms of concessions or of already accepted facts. Desirable but untimely features were postponed until the essential points of the standing army and the *Landwehr* were secured by royal approval. The ministry, and it included men who had uttered many misgivings at the calling of the masses to arms in the preceding year, approved the memoir unanimously, without once raising the arguments so frequently heard from the opponents of Scharnhorst's ideas between 1807 and 1810. Boyen had counted and counted rightly that the time for action was while the needs and the deeds of the citizen army of 1813 were fresh in all minds. To the king he could urge the importance of taking a step for national defense before he left to meet his fellow-sovereigns and allies at the Congress of Vienna. The clear and logical plan with its manifold advantages as presented by Boyen gave Frederick William III. no chance to hesitate or postpone for fear of a revolutionary army. The law for universal military service was proclaimed on September 3, 1814.

Boyen's law opens, as did Scharnhorst's draft, with the words of Frederick William I., "Every citizen is bound to defend his

[12] Meinecke, *Boyen,* vol. I., and Boyen's *Erinnerungen.* The first volume of Meinecke's biography represents the highest type of such studies. *Cf., e. g.,* pp. 80–89 for a penetrating analysis of Boyen's relation to Kant's teachings.

[13] Meinecke, *Boyen,* I., appendix 3, pp. 417 ff.

Fatherland."[14] The obligation rested upon all after the twentieth year. Five years were to be passed in the standing army—three of these in active service and two as reservists on leave. Then came seven years in the first call of the *Landwehr* with the obligation to serve abroad as well as at home, to participate in occasional reviews and drills on set days, and once annually to participate with the regular army in larger manoeuvres. The second summons of the *Landwehr* filled out seven years more with occasional drills, the obligation to do garrison duty in war, and the possibility of service abroad in need. After these nineteen years they were to hold themselves ready for service in the *Landsturm,* which included all between the ages of seventeen and fifty who were in any way able to bear arms. Its uses were purely defensive. The citizens who could show a certain degree of education and could furnish their own arms and uniforms served only one year with the colors and then generally in special troops (*Jäger und Schützen*) followed by two years as reservists and had a prior right to officers' places in the *Landwehr.* The standing army was to form the core of this army, thus preserving in the new national army the best proved product of the old régime.

The historical importance of Boyen's law can escape no thinking mind to-day. The other two military-political crises in Prussian history, the Thirty Years' War and the wars against Louis XIV., had been followed by the reorganization of the Prussian army and state. The Napoleonic period was now closed in the same way. Universal military service and the law which embodied it made a new citizenship and was in a truly Prussian-Hohenzollern sense a constitution which was to knit together the areas called Prussian after 1815. It was such a constitution as might be proclaimed, even by one of the weakest of a dynasty, which had been raised on the shields of warriors in a state whose martial past sanctified military service above ballots and party loyalty. Through it Prussia was prepared to enter on its twofold task of becoming a constitutional state and of unifying Germany. Much of the history of the nineteenth century is occupied with the establishment of nationality. None is more important than that in Germany, made possible by the development of the Prussian army as Scharnhorst and Boyen conceived it. Since 1870 every great power of Europe, except England, has adopted the Prussian universal military service. Such legislations and the

[14] Treitschke, *Geschichte Deutschlands im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* I. 587–594, 724, 735, is the only general account readily available. Source material for the details in *Beihefte zum Militair-Wochenblatt,* October, 1854, and December, 1862.

armies created by it, has then necessarily conditioned every other piece of legislation in every one of these states. It has influenced international policies and finally it has celebrated its greatest triumph by becoming a philosophy of political life.[15]

Is it too much for the historian looking back over the century to say that it is the most important statute of the nineteenth century, and that that century began on September 3, 1814? It may be left for future historians to say whether that historical century did not end just a hundred years later when in the first weeks of September, 1914, the German army was rolled back from the heights of the Marne.

GUY STANTON FORD.

[15] For the most extensive argument for the benefits of Prussian universal military service see the article on "Conscription" by Colonel F. N. Maude, the English military critic, in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

ANGLO-FRENCH COMMERCIAL RIVALRY, 1700–1750: THE WESTERN PHASE, I.[1]

The rivalry between England and France is perhaps the most conspicuous feature of eighteenth-century history from 1700 to 1763. The part that commercial competition played in accentuating that rivalry, though readily understood, has received inadequate treatment at the hands of the historians. Much still remains obscure and many important relations still remain untraced, but enough stands clearly before us to render comprehensible the main features of the situation.

In the contest for colonial and commercial control of the New World, which began at the close of the fifteenth century, a movement was ushered in which has no parallel in history until the present day. Portugal and Spain, the first of the European states to enter the field of exploration, were spared the cut-throat rivalry of later times by the papal line of demarcation, and each power became a monopolist in its assigned portion of the world. But the ascendancy of these states was short-lived, owing to the limitations of their colonial interests, for Spain from the beginning and Portugal for a considerable period, though to a lesser degree, acted as gold and silver supplying countries, and pushed their cult of the metals to such an extreme as to become in large part minor competitors in the rivalry of later times. Though each remained a factor to be reckoned with, even after 1700 when the great age of the West Indies began, yet each was already on its decline and its attitude was largely defensive as far as the other powers were concerned.

As compared with the Dutch, the Spaniards and Portuguese were but pawns in the great contest. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, Hollanders and Zeelanders were controlling the carrying trade between the Mediterranean and the Baltic and were already encroaching on the coastwise traffic of the Iberian Peninsula. With the turn of the century, during the course of the war with Spain,

[1] This paper, which in briefer form was read before the International Congress of Historical Studies at London in April, 1913, is based in large part on the writings of the eighteenth-century mercantilist pamphleteers, and designedly so. My object has been not so much to discover what the actual conditions were, as to understand what contemporary writers thought they were. Final conclusions on the general subject must await, of course, a thorough investigation of other classes of material, chiefly documentary, in England, France, and America.

to which Portugal was at that time annexed, they pushed their way into the far East, ousting the Portuguese from their seats in the Indies and seizing all Portuguese commerce in those parts. In 1623 they began the attack on the Spanish plate-fleets, obtained control of the most important places held by the Portuguese in Guinea, and, though unable to maintain a hold on the Lower Amazon, succeeded in dispossessing the Portuguese of six of their fourteen coast provinces in Brazil, establishing their capital at Recife (Pernambuco).[2] With the attainment of unity and independence, the states of the Dutch Republic started on a career of commercial activity that carried their ships into all quarters of the globe, and for a century and a half their vessels came and went as agents of demand and supply, distributing the staples of the world-market and acting as purveyors and middlemen of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. From 1600 to 1675 the Dutch were at the height of their commercial supremacy, and their vessels were in every port searching for opportunities of traffic. The early French colonies in the West Indies depended on the Dutch ships for their very existence,[3] and the British colonies as well deemed the Dutch carrying trade essential to their own prosperity.[4] The Dutch vessels carried fish from the British Seas, tobacco from the American continent, and sugar, tobacco, and other tropical products from the West Indies, and exchanged them for food stuffs and manufactured goods from France, Spain, Portugal, and the Straits, and from the East Countries, Germany, and Brabant.[5] East and west, north and south, sometimes in ports of their own making, but more often in the ports of colonies founded by other nations, Dutch merchants and traders, sea-captains and masters bartered and sold their ladings for goods or ready money, and returned with well-filled vessels, either directly to other countries or to their own harbors, notably Amsterdam, where the staples of America, Africa, and the Orient were worked up into manufactured articles or increased in value by refining or distilling and then reexported and sold to their European neighbors. The Dutch never

[2] Huet, *Memoirs of the Dutch Trade* (transl., 1722); Campbell, *Candid and Impartial Considerations on the Nature of the Sugar Trade* (1763), pp. 14–16; Edmundson, *English Historical Review*, "Dutch Power in Brazil", XI. 231, XIV. 676, "The Dutch in the Amazon", XVIII. 642, XIX. 1.

[3] Mims, *Colbert's West India Policy*, pp. 2, 3, 19–20. John Scott says that before 1652, when the navigation act of 1651 debarred them from the trade, the Dutch, "by the great credit which they had given the planters in Barbadoes, had brought that island to its utmost perfection". "Description of Barbadoes", British Museum, Sloane 3662, ff. 62–50 (reversed).

[4] Beer, *The Origins of the British Colonial System*, pp. 356–358.

[5] *A Collection of Advertisements, Advices, and Directions relating to the Royal Fishery within the British Seas* (1695), pp. 22–23.

became effective colonists because the trade motive was always uppermost in their minds, but they won their great success by adhering to "the simple and plain maxim that those who can sell the best commodity cheapest will always command the market".[6] In an era of colonial beginnings the Dutch were as indispensable to the world's progress as are the great distributing agents of the present day.

England and France, without a merchant marine at this stage of their maritime development, viewed with alarm the maritime ascendancy of the Dutch and saw with indignation the mastery that the latter had obtained over the commercial concerns of their colonies. But before 1650 neither country had attained that condition of internal peace which rendered successful competition possible. They could do little with a people whose business organization was so complete and whose trading instinct was so highly developed that it could underbid competitors both in prices and in freight-rates, and could meet the demands of its customers in the variety and abundance of the goods offered better than any other nation in the world. Competition with the Dutch was bound to result in failure. A matching of wits in the field of business enterprise and shrewdness was a game that neither French nor English merchants were prepared to engage in with any hope of success. Whenever they tried it the results were inglorious, as in the case of the whale fishery, from which the whalers of England and New England were never able to drive their Dutch rivals,[7] and of the herring fishery, "the greatest trade and the best gold mine belonging to the United Provinces",[8] in which the Dutch were supreme well on into the eighteenth century, despite long and searching inquiry on England's part into the causes of their superiority, and frequent attempts to emulate their methods and policy.[9] There was no chance of success in open

[6] Campbell, *Candid and Impartial Consideration*, p. 19. See Decker, *An Essay, on the Causes of the Decline of the Foreign Trade* (second ed., 1750), pp. 18, 104, and Sir William Temple, *Observations upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands* (eighth ed., 1747).

[7] On the whale fishery see Otis Little, *The State of the Trade of the Northern Colonies Considered* (1748), p. 17. Sir Francis Brewster, writing in 1702, said, "The Dutch and Hamburghers, not to name the French, Imploy near Twenty Thousand Men in the Greenland-fishing, and we not One." *New Essays on Trade* (1702), p. 6.

[8] This sentence is taken from a proclamation of the States General, dated July 19, 1624.

[9] In 1663 the Council of Trade considered at one of its meetings how best to gain and improve the fishery trade, and in the course of the debate made a careful inquiry into the reasons for the success of the Dutch. Andrews, *Committees, Commissions, and Councils*, pp. 82–84. Contemporary pamphlet literature contains frequent reference to Dutch methods and success. See, for example, William de Britaine, *The Dutch Usurpation* (1672), pp. 30–31; Petyt, *Britannia*

rivalry, for in a trade free to all nations, the Dutch were able to hold their own before the world.

Hence the only alternative was deliberate war. The Dutch must be driven from the field by force. Partly as a cause and partly as a consequence of this necessity, there were gradually shaped in the minds of those engaged in the economic upbuilding of the maritime states of the period certain ideas regarding the utility of colonies, never very well defined, but based on the principle that outlying possessions were of value only as far as their resources reinforced the strength of the mother state and aided in the promotion of her material welfare.[10] Experience soon tended to crystallize these ideas and to bring into prominence three commercial factors: the mother-country; the colonies with their tropical products; and certain supplemental areas of supply, such as Africa with its slaves and the temperate zone colonies with their provisions, live stock, and lumber, all of which were essential to the prosperity of the parent state, in furnishing the resources needed to meet the inevitable conflict with other European powers. The conflict was inevitable because to the mercantilist the ascendancy of one state was gained at the ex-

Languens (1680), pp. 167–168; Withers, *The Dutch better Friends than the French* (1713), which contains answers to nine charges against the Dutch as rivals in trade; and Wood, *Survey of Trade* (1718), pp. 100–101. The fullest contemporary survey of English and Dutch rivalry in the fishery is *A Collection of Advertisements, Advices, and Directions* (1695), which endeavors to show why the English fishery was unprofitable and the Dutch successful. For the general subject see Elder, *The Royal Fishery Company of the Seventeenth Century*. A frequent topic of discussion in English naval and fishery circles was the Dutch encroachment on the British sovereignty of the seas and their supplanting "by artifice the trade and traffic of the king's subjects". Arguments were constantly presented to prove "the King's exclusive propriety of dominion in the seas coasting on his Kingdom both as to passage and fishing therein". Tanner, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Library of Samuel Pepys*, I., *Sea Manuscripts*, pp. 58–59. Fuller, *The Sovereignty of the Sea* (1911), presents in an admirable and authoritative manner an exposition of this subject. He shows that the claim was a doctrine of the Stuarts, "introduced from Scotland to England with that dynasty, and terminating with it", and that it was aimed particularly against the Dutch. The boundaries of the British Seas are given on pages 521–522 of his work.

[10] Campbell, writing of the islands ceded by the treaty of 1763, in his *Candid and Impartial Considerations*, pp. 203–204, states the case as follows: "To explain the true value, and to ascertain the real importance of those islands, that are now become ours. This can be only done, by contemplating them in different lights, that is, in those several and separate points of view, from which they may every one of them become more or less, immediately or remotely, directly or indirectly, assisting to the interests, increasing the power, augmenting the commerce, extending the navigation, and thereby promoting the welfare of Great Britain; or, in other words, conducing to the industry, the independency, and the happiness, of their fellow citizens and fellow subjects, who are the inhabitants of this their Mother Country. These are the great ends, these the ultimate design of Colonies."

pense of the others, either by an enlargement of the sources of the wealth of the state or by the destruction of the sources of a rival's wealth. Trade and conquest went together.[11] As in the seventeenth century the English and French were the chief colonizing powers, their success could be won only by driving the Dutch from the established position which the latter had won as traffickers in the world's market.

England was the first to begin the attack. As early as 1621, an order in Council forbade the colonists of Virginia to permit strangers to trade with them and required them to ship their tobacco directly to England. This order was repeated several times between 1621 and 1634. Then came the navigation act of 1651, prohibiting every nation to bring into England any goods or merchandise but what were of their own growth or manufacture; three wars between 1652 and 1674; the wider navigation acts of 1660, 1663, and 1672; the seizure of New Netherland in America in 1664; the various struggles for control in the East and along the Guinea Coast, all of which show that England and Holland were engaged in a bitter commercial war,

[11] This idea underlay at all times the reasoning of the mercantilist pamphleteers. Citations from five of them will suffice:

"We should consider, that our Navigation can neither be kept or enlarged by the same Methods it had its former growth; we had then no Competitors, but we have now so many and powerful, that we may reasonably fear a time when our Navigation must be managed, as the Jews Built the Walls of Jerusalem, one hand in the Work, and the other to hold a Weapon." Brewster, *New Essays on Trade* (1702), preface.

"Let us learn to consider our Sugar Colonies as engaged in a mortal combat with those of Foreign Nations, in which either they or we, according to all human probability, must fall." *Caribbeana* (1741), I. 195.

"Ruining the trade of our adversaries and thereby raising our own." *The State of the Nation Considered* (1747), p. 10.

"As every state in Europe seems desirous of increasing its Trade, and the Acquisition of Wealth enlarges the Means of power, it is necessary, in order to preserve an Equality with them, that this Kingdom extends its Commerce in proportion; but to acquire a Superiority, due Encouragement ought to be given to such of its Branches, as will most effectually enrich its Inhabitants. As trade enables the Subject to support the Administration of Government, the lessening or destroying that of a Rival, has the same effect, as if this Kingdom had enlarged the Sources of its own Wealth; it is evident from hence, that it is not sufficient to support the Credit of a Country with its Neighbours, that its Commerce be enlarged only, unless its Increase be proportionate to theirs. But, as an Ascendency is to be gained by checking the Growth of theirs, as well as by the Increase of our own, whenever one of these happens to be the Consequence of the other to this Nation, its Figure and Reputation will rise to a greater Height than ever." Otis Little, *The State of the Trade of the Northern Colonies Considered* (1748), pp. 8–9.

The French now endeavor "to obstruct the English Commerce in all Parts of the World, as by that means they will not only increase their own Power and Influence, but in proportion weaken ours". *Wisdom and Policy of the French* (1755), p. 125.

and that England was endeavoring to break the commercial net that the Dutch had woven about her and her colonies. France began the attack with the rise of Colbert. Cayenne was captured in 1664. A high protective tariff of the same year was continued by new duties imposed on foreign manufactures in 1667. These duties, which were abolished in 1668 owing to Dutch retaliation but re-established after Colbert's death in 1683, led to trade quarrels which preceded and in large part caused the wars between France and Holland at the end of the century. During this period decrees were issued forbidding the governors of Guadeloupe, Martinique, and other French West India islands, to receive and trade with the Dutch vessels, and a new West India Company was granted its monopoly for the express purpose of undermining the Dutch trade. Constant iteration of commands to colonial governors, the conviction and punishment of offenders, and successful efforts to drive out foreigners found cruising in the waters of the French West Indies had their effect and Dutch trade decreased.[12] The French merchant marine grew in size and strength. The founding of the Senegal Company in 1672 ended in the capture from the Dutch of the island of Goree and of Arguin five years later, and led to the establishment of French control over the African trade from Cape Blanco to the Gambia River. Similarly the incorporation of the English Royal African Company in 1672 and the royal confirmation of its monopoly from Sallee to the Cape of Good Hope added a fourth to the competitors for the African trade,[13] and was followed by many years of rival trading in West Africa, in which Dutch, English, French, and Portuguese all had a part. Already had the Portuguese, freed at last from the domination of Spain in 1640, recovered control of their possessions in Brazil, and this loss to the Dutch was only in part met by the English restoration of Surinam in the treaty of Breda of 1667.

But the Dutch fought hard for the retention of their monopoly. In this effort they were aided by the French and English colonies themselves, which having experienced the advantages of an open market submitted unwillingly to the enforcement of laws that

[12] Mims, *Colbert's West India Policy*, chs. VIII. and IX.; *An Inquiry into the Revenue, Credit and Commerce of France* (1742), pp. 24–26.

[13] "Account of the Limits and Trade of the Royal African Company", *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1669–1674, § 936. This account, undated but belonging to the period between 1672 and 1697, tells us that the slaves obtained by the company were sent to the American plantations, "which cannot subsist without them", but that all other commodities were carried to England. This statement is an early recognition of the importance of Africa as a supplemental area of supply for the tropical British Colonies.

seemed to sacrifice their prosperity to that of the mother-country.[14] Both in Guadeloupe and in Martinique, the planters were unfriendly and even hostile to the French West India Company, because it failed to meet their needs as the Dutch had done and in its business dealings was much less efficient than the Dutch had been.[15] In Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands the British navigation acts aroused strong opposition, and in Barbadoes, at least, the complaint was heard that the English merchant was less liberal than the Dutch, and the Royal African Company less satisfactory than the Dutch slave-traders. Even in the seventeenth century the Barbadoes planters insisted that the sugar trade was much burdened by being confined to one market, and in the next century the enumeration of sugar was the subject of constant complaint.[16] Despite the navigation acts and other instruments of commercial warfare, the Dutch were far from despoiled of their traffic. They continued to lead in the whale and herring fisheries in the waters of the North Atlantic and the North Sea; they remained the greatest traders along the Guinea Coast and a thorn in the flesh of the Royal African Company; and after the African trade was thrown open in 1697, they competed successfully with the company and with private British traders through half the eighteenth century.[17] They held important positions in the West Indies and continued to be sugar carriers throughout our colonial period, and they dominated the route to the East and controlled the Spice Islands for many years after the colonies had won their independence. Both Dalby Thomas and Sir Josiah Child speak of the menace of Dutch rivalry, and as late as 1739, Sir Matthew Decker can call the Dutch "our great rivals in trade", referring chiefly to trade with the European continent.[18]

[14] Mr. Beer says, "It cannot be questioned that the laws of trade were retarding the economic development of these [the Leeward] islands." *The Old Colonial System*, pt. I., vol. II., pp. 33, 45.

[15] Mims, *Colbert's West India Policy*, pp. 90–99, 101–106, 108, 179.

[16] Littleton, in *The Groans of the Plantations* (1689), a very pessimistic and highly exaggerated presentation of the condition of things in Barbadoes, enumerates seven burdens on the sugar trade at that time: the four and a half per cent. export duty, "extorted from us against our wills"; customs duties at home; the act of 1672, preventing export to the other British plantations; the enumeration of 1660; the act of 1663; the monopoly of the negro trade granted to the Royal African Company; and the added duties on sugar imported into England after 1685.

[17] Houston, *Some New and Accurate Observations of the Coast of Guinea* (1725), pp. 18–19; Atkins, *A Voyage to Guinea, Brasil, and the West Indies* (1735), pp. 149–186.

[18] Decker, *Essay on the Causes of the Decline of the Foreign Trade* (1744), p. 20. This work, begun in 1739, is full of references to the superiority of the Dutch. Contemporary opinion regarding the effectiveness of the Dutch rivalry can be inferred from the fact that in 1713 John Withers found it necessary to

But the Dutch trade, though strongly entrenched, was gradually broken as far as America and the West Indian colonies were concerned. At the close of the seventeenth century France and England, the greatest states of the European world, after persistent efforts for forty years, had deprived the Dutch of their maritime and commercial supremacy. They now stood face to face, two powers actuated by like commercial and colonizing aims. Neither Portugal, Spain, nor Holland had sought for colonial power in the mercantilist sense of the term, for the discovery of mines early diverted in a measure the attention of the Portuguese, the Spaniards were ambitious for gold and conquest, and the Dutch had few territorial and colonizing designs. France and England were fairly matched rivals, in that their policies were the same, to acquire colonies in the interest of trade, shipping, and manufactures, to exclude the foreigner from the colonial market, and to make the welfare and wealth of the mother state the first and chief object of the efforts of all, colonies and mother-country alike.

The two great antagonists faced each other in five different parts of the world, India, Africa, the West Indies, Canada, and the Mississippi; and as far as the Atlantic Basin was concerned they wrestled and fought for the control of four groups of economic commodities: negroes; sugar, tobacco, indigo, and other tropical and semi-tropical products, among which sugar was by far the most important; fish; furs and naval stores. In each of these particulars the growth of French trade and colonization after 1700 seemed to threaten the supremacy of England, and during the years before 1750 intensified the rivalry of the two powers until that rivalry culminated in armed conflict in the years from 1756 to 1763. The struggle took place in the East as well as the West, but it is to the latter phase that I would direct attention here.

The struggle for the control of the fisheries is as old as the settlement of the colonies, and has in diminished form survived until very recent times. Even in 1670 the English complained that "the French in their seamen and shipping by their fishery do much increase",[19] and a few years later Petyt in *Britania Languens* could assert that the Iceland fishing was very much decayed and the New-

write a letter "from a Citizen to a Country Gentleman", entitled *The Dutch better Friends than the French*, in which he argued against a prevailing British opinion that the Dutch were "rivals with us in our trade, and undermine us in our commerce; and that if these Froglanders were once crushed, the trade of the world would be our own", pp. 33–34. He endeavored to show that in reality the French were England's great rivals and the Dutch England's friends. See above, note 9.

[19] *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1669–1674, § 362, 1.

foundland fishing and Greenland fishing quite lost, the Dutch having driven the English out of these trades and the French of later years having "struck into a good share of the whole, beating out the English more and more".[20] "At this time", says Mr. Beer, "the French were rapidly acquiring an unquestionable superiority. They made more and better cured fish and arrived earlier at the European markets."[21] The New Englanders resented the various surrenders of Nova Scotia to France as parting with a noble fishery and as an execrable treachery to the best interests of all,[22] and they welcomed with high approval the conquest of that country in 1710, as a check to the growing superiority of the French, who before 1700 were threatening to drive the English out of the Continental fish market.[23] In 1731 a well-informed writer, commenting on the Newfoundland fishery, could speak of the French as "our most prejudicial rivals in the fishery of those parts".[24]

In the minds of the merchants and colonists of the early eighteenth century fish and furs were classed together, with lumber and the mast trade holding a place of scarcely inferior importance. The enumeration of naval stores in 1706 and of beaver and other furs in 1722 was in part an effort to keep those valuable staples out of the hands of the French, and Cadwallader Colden, in his essays on the Indian trade,[25] devoted considerable space to a discussion of the relative strength of the English and French in their control over the traffic in furs. As early as 1729 the merchants complained that the French were underselling the English in foreign beaver markets.[26] No one saw more clearly the nature of the struggle than did Governor Shirley of Massachusetts, and in his correspondence from 1741 to 1756 we find special stress laid on the economic significance of the contest for Canada. He viewed the capture of Louisburg in 1745 and the projected Canadian expedition of the next year not in terms of conquest but of codfish and peltry, and he deemed the great merit of his own services to the British crown

[20] Petyt, *Britania Languens or a Discourse of Trade* (1680), pp. 167–169.

[21] *The Old Colonial System*, pt. I., vol. II., pp. 227–228.

[22] *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1669–1674, § 68, 1697–1699, § 82, 1699, §§ 247, 746, VII.

[23] After the Restoration, says Mr. Beer, "the English were entirely driven out of the French market and had difficulty in maintaining themselves in Portugal, Spain, and Italy". *The Old Colonial System*, pt. I., vol. II., p. 227.

[24] *A Short Answer to an Elaborate Pamphlet* (1731), p. 17. Postlethwayt could say in 1750 that the French had a larger number of vessels than the English in the fishery, and were able to supply themselves with what they formerly had from English ships and also parts of Spain and Italy. Their fishery ascendancy covered cod from Newfoundland, herring from the North Sea, and whales from northern waters. *Short State*, pp. 81–end.

[25] *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, V. 726–733.

[26] *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial*, VI. 207; *cf.* vol. III., § 165.

to lie in his having saved the English codfishery more than once from falling into the hands of the French.[27] When he urged upon the British government the conquest of Canada, he emphasized its importance as throwing the whole fur-trade into British hands, as breaking up the French fishery settlements in the gulf and river of St. Lawrence, and as turning the great profits and advantages of the fishery, with its demand for rum and clothing and its value as a nursery for seamen, over to the subjects of Great Britain.[28] He viewed the French encroachments on Maine and New Hampshire as an interference with the mast trade, because from that frontier the royal navy drew its supply of masts and yards, and he looked on the struggle for the Mohawk Valley as a contest for the beaver trade, the diminution of which provoked war with the French in Canada.[29] He showed himself a mercantilist when he saw that in the struggle with France the success of England's commercial policy was at stake. Should England drive France from America, he said, "the profits of the whole trade of these colonies will all finally center in her, her navigation will be greatly increased, and the balance of her growing trade with North America will forever be in her favor; and what seems to make these advantages still more valuable is that they weaken the power of France whilst they add to that of Great Britain.[30] But Shirley's warnings were not heeded. English eyes were fixed on the tropics and the sugar trade, and Louisburg was given back to France in 1748.[31] France maintained her leadership in the western fisheries, and both in Canada and the Mississippi Valley, from the Illinois Country to the Gulf, extended the area of her fur-trade, that valuable trade in the skins of the lynx, muskrat, otter, beaver, and other furred denizens of the wilderness, which played so important a part in the colonial activity of the time.

Much more serious from the standpoint of the mercantilist was the rivalry of England and France in Africa and the West Indies, for there lay the traffic in slaves and the seat of the sugar trade.

[27] *Correspondence of William Shirley* (ed. Lincoln), I. 162, 163, 243; II. 1–2.
[28] *Ibid.*, I. 284–285.
[29] *Ibid.*, I. 328, 348, 351, 452; II. 45, 59–60, 149, 180, 292–293.
[30] *Ibid.*, I. 285.
[31] The author of *The State of the Nation Considered* (1747), in speaking of the war of 1745–1746, says that the object was "the destruction of the French trade and shipping" and that as the result of the capture of Louisburg the fur-trade was lost to the French "totally on Canada side", there remaining "only their trade to the West Indies and the Mississippi", which, he adds, "we must be guilty of the highest negligence imaginable to suffer them to carry on another summer", pp. 4–5, 36–37. To this writer, who in 1747 criticized the conduct of the war because the "genius of Britain droop't", the surrender of Louisburg must have seemed a terrible mistake.

For the French, the production of sugar centred in Guadeloupe, Martinique, and Santo Domingo; for the English, first in Surinam, and then in Barbadoes, the Leeward Islands, and Jamaica. Though Barbadoes began with indigo, ginger, cotton, and tobacco, the planters there soon turned their attention to sugar, and even Jamaica, which had at first made promising experiments with cocoa, discouraged by disasters that injured the trees, yielded to the demands of the British housewife and coffee-houses, and made sugar her leading commodity. Before the beginning of the British sugar industry in the West Indies,[32] the Portuguese had supplied European countries with sugars from Brazil, but soon after the Restoration England had supplanted the Portuguese and the Dutch and was carrying muscovado in her own ships to the British Isles and the northern British colonies, and re-exporting large quantities to the Continent, particularly to Holland and Hamburg. France, though supplying her own market after 1670, partly because of her system of preferential duties, exported but little until the end of the century.[33] Thus England seemed in a fair way to monopolize the market outside of France.

Complaints against the French began to be heard as early as 1666, due to the increased output of the French colonies and to the virtually prohibitive duty that France had imposed on English sugars in order to shut English exporters out of the French market.[34] But the first hint of serious competition came in 1701, when Governor Codrington of the Leeward Islands wrote from Antigua that the French were beginning to tread on England's heels in the sugar trade,[35] and he recommended an act of Parliament prohibiting entirely all exports of beef, provisions, and lumber from Ireland

[32] The date of the introduction of sugar planting into Barbadoes is uncertain. "About 1626" ("On the Sugar Trade", *Caribbeana*, II. 33) is too early; "After the Restoration" (Campbell, *Candid and Impartial Considerations*, p. 9) is too late. Ligon speaks of sugar as a staple in 1647, and Winthrop, having mentioned only cotton as a staple from Barbadoes in 1643, adds in 1646 sugar, tobacco, and indigo (*Journal*, Original Narratives ed., II. 122, 328). These statements agree with that of Scott ("Description of Barbadoes", Brit. Mus., Sloane 3662). "The sugar cane was brought to Barbadoes first by one Pieter Brower of North Holland from Brazil Anno 1637, but came to no considerable perfection till the year 1645." There seems to be no good reason for doubting the truth of what Scott says, though his reputation for veracity is not high and he wrote his history thirty years after the first date mentioned.

[33] Colbert wrote to Governor de Baas October 10, 1670, "Foreigners no longer bring us sugar. We have begun since six weeks or two months to export it to them." Mims, *Colbert's West India Policy*, p. 207.

[34] France while levying a duty of but four livres on sugar from her own colonies, placed one of thirty-two livres on that from the foreign sugar islands. *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1669–1674, p. 215.

[35] *Ibid.*, 1701, p. 417.

and the northern British colonies to the French islands. Between 1701 and 1725 the advance was so rapid that, according to Joshua Gee, the French were not only supplying France, but were underselling the British in the Continental market, notably at Hamburg, in Flanders, Holland, and Spain, and at the Straits, with Portugal, furnished the Levant with sugar from Brazil.[36]

As this ominous situation began to dawn upon the British planters, a vigorous discussion arose, in which the pamphleteers endeavored to discover the cause of French success and British failure.[37] They ascribed the former to the preponderance of France in Europe since 1672, particularly during the period of absolutism under Louis XIV.; to the more highly organized system of colonial and commercial control whereby the mother-country and the colonies were bound closely together, working in harmony and with despatch;[38] and finally to state aid, judiciously furnished, to wise measures concerning trade and navigation, and to a more liberal

[36] Gee, *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered* (third ed., 1731), pp. 44–45.

[37] Gee, pp. 137–139, 142–144, 150–151. The subject was a matter of constant discussion from this time on. See *The Present State of the British Sugar Colonies Considered* (1731), p. 8 *et seq.*; *The National Merchant* (1736), pp. 85–107; Postlethwayt, *Great Britain's True System* (1757), pp. 246–268; and especially *The Present State of the British and French Trade to Africa and America considered and compared, with some Propositions in Favour of the Trade of Great Britain* (1745).

[38] Frequent reference is made to the French Council of Commerce established by royal decree, June 29, 1700. The council is described in *The Wisdom and Policy of the French* (1755), pp. 38–73; and in Postlethwayt, *Great Britain's True System*, pp. 246–248. The writer of the former pamphlet likens the council to a "piece of clockwork, which by its springs directs the wheels in their motion". He thinks that the plan of it was borrowed from that of the Board of Trade of 1696, but with this difference "that the French have steadily adhered to the rules and institutions of the board", while the English have not done so, "which has been the root and cause of many evils, both as it relates to His Majesty's subjects in America and to the Trade and Commerce of the English Nation". He thinks, further, that French superiority lay not in the greater ability of the French statesmen or in a warmer zeal or greater application to the service of the country, but in "the mutual Relation and Subordination of their Boards" (pp. 129–130). He adds, "if England was to commence a War against France, in support of her Trade and Colonies, what could be hoped from it, unless we first correct the Abuses, which have through time crept into the Offices" (p. 128). The early mercantilists criticized the appointment of the Board of Trade by the crown, and declared that it should have been made dependent on the House of Commons. "Why a Council of Trade was taken out of the Hands of the Parliament, when they were upon it", writes Brewster, "they can best tell that advised it." These men thought that only merchants should be members of the board, on the ground that "none are so proper to advise in Trade, as they that are bred in it". Brewster, *New Essays on Trade* (1702), pp. 55, 63. The French royal council was continued by decrees of June 22, 1722, and May 29, 1730.

policy in respect of customs and drawbacks than prevailed in England.[39] Over against these advantages they placed the heavy burdens that lay upon the British sugar planters. Chief among these was the enumeration of sugar, according to which sugar could not be shipped directly to foreign markets, but had first to be unloaded and landed in England, whence after the payment of slight duties it could be exported to the Continent. This roundabout route increased the cost of getting the sugar to market. Other financial disadvantages were the payment of the four and a half per cent. export duty in Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands, and the heavy and increasing customs duties in England, protests against which began to be heard as early as 1671, when Parliament proposed to lay an additional duty on sugar.[40] Similarly, the planters were aggrieved at the efforts of the sugar refiners in England to prevent them from refining sugar in the islands, an outcropping of the mercantilist doctrine against manufacturing in the colonies, and as true of France as it was true of England.[41] They complained, furthermore, of the curtailing of the market by the act of 1670, which forbade direct exportation to Ireland,[42] and they declared that while the French colonies were growing in wealth and prosperity, the British colonies were declining, suffering from an impoverishment of their soil,[43] from a high and increasing cost of living, and from

[39] Decrees of June, 1698, and April, 1717, regulating the commerce of the French colonies, prohibited direct trade with other colonies; but these decrees were in part rescinded by those of January and October, 1726, permitting the exporting of produce from the French islands to Spain. The decrees of 1726 were frequently quoted in full by English writers and were even read in the House of Commons.

[40] Petitions of the merchants and sugar refiners induced the House of Lords to amend the bill, and thus gave rise to an interesting constitutional crisis. *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1669–1674, pp. 213–214.

[41] This attempt of the sugar refiners was similar to the efforts made at a later time to restrict the wool, hat, and iron industries in the continental colonies. *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1669–1674, §§ 519, 520. See the *Report* of the American Historical Association, 1892, pp. 36–44. We are told that all sugar for table use in Antigua in 1774 was imported from England at a high price. Probably much the same condition prevailed in all the West India Islands belonging to Great Britain. Brit. Mus., Egerton 2423, pp. 122–123. There is an interesting protest against sugar refining in the West Indies in P. R. O., Treasury 1, bundle 338.

[42] By act of 1663 Ireland was forbidden to send any of her exports, except servants, horses, victuals, and salt for the New England and Newfoundland fisheries, to any of the colonies. By that of 1670, she was forbidden to receive any of the enumerated commodities by direct export from the colonies. For the effect of these laws upon Ireland see Hutchinson, *The Commercial Restraints of Ireland Considered* (1779), pp. 181–183.

[43] "Our old islands, by being less mountainous, and almost entirely cleared of wood, are become extremely dry and unseasonable; at the same time that the lands in them, by long and constant planting, have so far lost the spring and

the want of an adequate circulating medium, which involved them in a constant fear of losing what specie they had. The remedies sought were a complete drawback on all re-exportation, repeal of the act of 1672, reduction of duties, direct trade with Ireland, and the privilege of free export to all points south of Cape Finisterre. In addition, some of the complainants demanded a reform of the business methods of the Custom House in London.[44] But in the eyes of the British merchant the situation became much more serious when it was discovered that the French were increasing their trade with Africa, were drawing their beef, lumber, and provision supply from Ireland and the British colonies on the American continent,

spirit of vegetation, as to stand in need of more rains than they had before. But this reflexion has never been attended to by our planters, who attribute solely to the less frequency of seasonable weather, that deficiency in their crops, which is in a great measure owing to the impoverishment of the soil." *Considerations which may tend to promote the Settlement of our new West-India Colonies* (1764), p. 37. This was not true of Jamaica, where it was computed in 1750 that out of 4,000,000 acres only 430,800 were cleared, and that in consequence the island was capable of great future development. "An Inquiry", etc., Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 30163. When the Ceded Islands were taken over in 1763 provision was made that part of the land should always be wooded to prevent the denudation that had injured the other islands. *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial,* IV. 583.

[44] A complete enumeration and examination of all the disadvantages presented by the writers of the period is manifestly impossible here. Dr. F. W. Pitman will soon publish his study of the economic development of the British West Indies during the colonial period, which is based on a thorough search of all the extant manuscript material. The pamphlet and manuscript literature is very extensive, the assertions made are often exaggerated and frequently contradictory, and the subjects involved, such as those relating to impoverishment, the effects of British legislation, and the want of a circulating medium, are complicated and often obscure. The best-known pamphlets are as follows: Gee, *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered* (1729); *The Importance of the Sugar Plantations* (1731); and *A Short Answer* to the same (1731); *The Present State of the British Sugar Colonies* (1731); Ashley, *The Sugar Trade with the Incumbrances thereon, laid open* (1734); *The National Merchant* (1736); Stubb, *Importance of the British Plantations in America* (1731); *Danger of Losing the Trade of the Sugar Colonies*; *The Case of His Majesty's Sugar Colonies* (1732); *The British Merchant* (3 vols.); *The State of the Sugar Trade* (1747); Postlethwayt, *A Short State of the Progress of the French Trade and Navigation* (1756); Coad, *A Letter to the Honorable the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations* (1747); Tucker, *A Brief Essay of the Advantages and Disadvantages which respectively attend France and Great Britain with regard to Trade* (1749); Postlethwayt, *Great Britain's True System* (1757). One of the best sources of information regarding conditions in Barbadoes is *Caribbeana* (1741, two vols.), covering the period from 1731 to 1740. For Jamaica, there is a valuable manuscript in the British Museum entitled, "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Scarcity of Money and the Bad Consequence of It to This Island, with some Proposals for a Remedy, wherein the Scheme of a Public Bank is offered" (1750). Many of the representations of the Board of Trade are of the highest importance, and a list of them is printed in the *Report* of the American Historical Association for 1913.

and in their exporting of tropical products were actually, though indirectly, invading the British market itself.

To assure the continued prosperity of their tropical colonies, the most highly valued of all their colonial possessions, both England and France were in need of two supplemental areas of supply. These were, first, a territory from which an ample and uninterrupted store of slaves could be obtained for the cane pieces, the rice fields, and the tobacco plantations of the southern and West Indian colonies, and, second, a fertile agricultural area in the temperate zone, which would provide a sufficient quantity of food and other necessary staples such as semi-tropical and tropical colonies demanded but could not furnish for themselves or obtain from the mother-country. The first of these was Africa,[45] which as the only source of negroes was the object of intense rivalry among all the maritime powers possessed of tropical and semi-tropical colonies. But, consisting as it did of a long strip of coast, upon which at that time no European state laid claim to property in land, each confining itself to rented ground suitable for factories and houses, it presented to the powers no opportunity for mutually exclusive control. Except as far as grants of monopoly led to acts of aggression and retaliation, the African rivalry took the form of a trade struggle. Quite otherwise was it with the second supplemental factor. France controlled Canada and the Mississippi, while England had her Bread Colonies from New England to Pennsylvania, which were valued by the mercantilist only because they supplied the Sugar Colonies with staples that England herself would be obliged to send when she could, were there no other source from which to obtain them.[46]

[45] Wood speaks of "the *Trade to Africa*, so very Advantagious to *Great Britain*, by conducing so much to the Support of our *Tobacco Colonies*, and *Sugar Plantations*", *Survey of Trade*, p. 189; and Dinwiddie, collector of customs at Bermuda, says the same, "on the supply of negroes from this [the African] coast, our sugar, tobacco and other plantations depend", C. O., 323: 9, M 24.

[46] This characteristic attitude of the British merchants toward the northern colonies is well expressed in Wood, *Survey of Trade* (1718). "Without our *Southern Plantations*, our *Northern Colonies* can be of *no* real Advantage to us; since what *they* are at present, must *cease* on the Decay or Loss of the SUGAR ISLANDS, from whence *their* Value to *Great Britain* chiefly arises, and for want of WHICH they would be otherwise *prejudicial Colonies* to their *Mother Country*" (p. 149). New England merchants, such as Gee and Banister, felt called upon constantly to defend New England and the northern colonies generally, before the Board of Trade, and to show the value of these colonies to England. Jeremiah Dummer, Connecticut's agent in England (1710–1730), presented a somewhat unusual view in his memorial of October 13, 1713, to the Board of Trade. "The fishery of New England", he says, "is of more concern because some years the Newfoundland fishery almost wholly fails, and by our last advice from thence there has been a great dearth and scarcity of fish there this season [1713].

Before the French obtained a footing on the African coast, the Portuguese, Dutch, and English had competed for the right to control the trade of the territory, England having seized Cape Coast Castle from Holland during the first Dutch war. With the acquisition of forts on the island of Goree and at Arguin and trading posts on the Senegal, the French began to extend their trading influence and a fourfold rivalry ensued, with the French to the north and the others in more immediate propinquity along the Guinea Coast and toward the Congo. Until 1697 the Royal African Company retained its monopoly, but in that year the trade was thrown open, and with the entrance upon the scene of private traders, among whom were many colonials, notably Rhode Islanders, the competition increased. The French strengthened their hold upon the Gambia trade,[47] while the Dutch dominated the Guinea Coast. So badly did the company conduct its business that it soon became unable to maintain its forts and garrisons, and in 1730 applied to Parliament for aid. Continued mismanagement and depression led to its dissolution in 1747 and to the establishment of a new corporation, the Company of Merchants trading to Africa, in 1750.[48] As the company's trade grew worse, the French extended their activi-

And without doubt the more fishery ground we have the greater our treasure is. As to the scale-fish and mackerel, I believe your Lordships will allow that to be of equal importance with the cod, because the Sugar Islands can't subsist without it. Their plantations depend wholly on their negroes, who are supported with this fish; whereas if the planters should for want of this fish feed their negroes with Irish beef, the charge of a plantation would consume the value of it." C. O., 5: 866, V 10.

Professor Callender, who very kindly read the manuscript of this paper in its final form, makes the following comment upon my estimate of the value of the northern British colonies in the British commercial system. "It does not seem to me that you state the case against them as strongly as the opinions expressed by the trade writers, at least of later times, would warrant. Postlethwayt, as I remember, did not scruple to hold that the northern colonies were a positive detriment to Great Britain. They actually rivalled her in the fisheries, reducing her share in them, and so prevented her sea-power from being what it would have been without them. Arthur Young held this position very strongly, in pointing out that the great development of shipping and the great number of seamen in them was not only no advantage to the mother-country but a positive disadvantage. The author of *American Husbandry* held too that their supplying the West Indies with provisions also injured her, since thereby she lost the only permanent regular market for flour and beef in the world, the corn trade of Europe being notoriously irregular, as it was the result of shortage of crops in different countries." What Professor Callender says of the later writers is in a measure true of earlier writers also.

[47] *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial,* vol. VI., § 271.

[48] In a memorial sent from Antigua in 1752 to the Board of Trade, the petitioners asserted that "by the failure of the African Company our rivals now have the trade". Oliver, *History of Antigua,* I. cix. For the business side of the trade with Africa, see W. R. Scott, *Joint Stock Companies,* II. 3–35.

ties southward, establishing posts at Gambia, Accra, and Whydah before 1735,[49] and trafficking within what the British claimed were their rights and privileges, under the very walls of the British forts and factories. They encroached on the company's field of slave supply and disputed with it and the private traders the traffic in gum, which they used in their hat and silk manufactures, and in gold, ivory, beeswax, and dye-woods, to the exclusion of British ships. In 1750 Postlethwayt could complain that the French had been making unjustifiable attempts for many years to raise their trade and navigation in that part of the world on the ruins of the British African trade and to monopolize that branch of commerce, upon which depended the prosperity and well-being of all the British colonies in America.[50]

A more flagrant insult in the eyes of British mercantilists was the growth of a lucrative trade between the British colonies of the temperate zone and the French West Indies, whereby the French islands were supplied with the provisions, lumber, and live stock which they needed for the maintenance of their slave labor and the promotion of their sugar trade. Such intercourse was contrary to the principles on which the British commercial system was founded, in that it involved the sending of French sugars to the northern British colonies and the invasion by France of the British home market. France was weak in having no satisfactory beef and provision colonies of her own. Colbert sought to supply beef from France in order to prevent export from Ireland, and he made strenuous efforts to build up Canada as a provision and lumber supplying colony. But in both respects he failed. French beef was never sufficient in amount, and Canada never became an agricultural colony during the French régime, remaining a land of furs and romance to the end.[51] The cities of France endeavored to meet

[49] Atkins, *A Voyage to Guinea*, pp. 107, 172. In 1730 Dinwiddie, collector of customs at Bermuda, wrote to the Board of Trade, "There is not anything gives the French and Dutch so great an opportunity to rival us in our trade with the Spanish dominions in the West Indies, as the encroachments they are daily making on our settlements on the coast of Africa, whereby the Company, as well as every private trader, are prevented the advantage of that trade as formerly." C. O., 323 : 9, M 24. In 1736 a Rhode Island sea-captain wrote from the English fort of Anamaboe on the Guinea Coast, "never was so much Rum on the Coast at one time before, Nor the like of the french shipers—never seen before for no. for the hole Coast is full of them", *Commerce of Rhode Island*, Mass. Hist. Soc. *Coll.*, seventh series, IX. 46.

[50] *A Short State of the Progress of the French Trade and Navigation* (1750), pp. 85–86.

[51] Mims, *Colbert's West India Policy*, pp. 318–325. The Northern Colonies in their defense said that if they were driven out of their trade to the French West Indies, the latter would turn elsewhere. "They have Cape Breton, Canada,

the bread and provision demand as far as they were able: Bordeaux and La Rochelle sent wine, brandy, staves, headings, and hoops; but Rouen seldom furnished provisions, supplying rather notions and assorted commodities, while Marseilles and Toulon confined themselves largely to oil, dried fruit, wines, and various light stuffs.

While thus France was failing to meet the demands of her West Indian colonies on the export side, she proved equally unsatisfactory in meeting their demands on the import side. As the French colonies produced sugar in larger and larger quantities, they accumulated an increasing amount of the by-products of sugar—molasses and rum. But neither of these by-products found extensive sale in France. Molasses was not palatable to the French taste, and the French people would not use it as food, so that the French island planters were compelled to give it to their horses or pigs or to throw it away, while rum was not wanted, because it was too raw a liquor for drinking purposes, and was discouraged because it competed when used with wines and brandies, which ranked high among French staples. Thus an important source of profit was unavailable as far as the French colonial planters were concerned. Therefore, in respect of the unity and co-ordination of the French colonial world, an anomalous condition existed, for which a remedy must be found. The French colonies had to have an adequate supply of slaves, a sufficient store of lumber, horses, and provisions, and a market for all their staples, sugar, molasses, and rum, if their success was to be assured.

Charles M. Andrews.

(*To be continued.*)

and also the Bay of Apalachy, and Mississippi, which the French Government would be glad to improve". *Case of the Northern Colonies.* But their opponents denied that any of these regions could be used as a source of supply. *Observations,* pp. 15, 28.

THE COTTON FACTORAGE SYSTEM OF THE SOUTHERN STATES[1]

LIKE many other features of its ante-bellum agricultural economy, the factorage system was not of Southern origin. It had its beginning in the West Indies. It is hardly possible definitely to fix the date of the factor's emergence into the scheme of colonial staple agriculture. He followed the trading companies, merchant adventurers, and similar instruments of colonization. He was an important cog in effecting the transition from the group to the individualistic system of agriculture. He was to the individual planter what the chartered companies had been to the whole body of colonists, or to the colony itself as a distinct entity.

The factor was the home agent of the colonial planter. He was at once his merchant and banker. He bought the goods which the planter had to purchase at home, and sold for him the products returned in exchange. He became an important link in the chain which brought Europe, Africa, and America into commercial association. If an Englishman wished to embark his son in the business of sugar planting in Jamaica or Barbadoes, he could negotiate the entire transaction with a factor in Bristol or London. The latter could purchase the estate, arrange with the African Company for the necessary complement of slaves, supply the needed equipment of machinery, merchandise, and tools, and otherwise outfit the enterprise. He would furthermore engage to finance the venture from start to finish.

The factor's business thus brought him into close and confidential relationships with many classes of people; with those who were or sought to become planters; with those holding grants or patents of colonial lands, and desiring settlers or purchasers therefor; with those engaged in the African trade, whether as dealers in slaves, or as manufacturers of commodities to be sent to Africa for slave-trading purposes; with those who handled the manifold articles used in the plantation colonies; with those who purchased plantation products sent home in payment of the enormous obligations incurred in undertaking and prosecuting such ventures; with the shipping interests engaged in effecting these various exchanges of slaves and goods; with the financial sources which supplied the

[1] A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, December 29, 1914.

reservoirs of capital which were constantly tapped in behalf of the factor's clients.

Knowing something of the intricacies and ramifications, as well as the magnitude of the business, we do not need specific documentary assurance of the standing and influence of the head of such an establishment, long and successfully conducted.

The business was extremely hazardous. The profits sought were correspondingly large. The ultimate fate of the West Indian planter was usually bankruptcy. Even a tropical soil could not forever meet the demands which such a system taxed against it, plus the extravagance and waste which the system engendered. For every planter who made good the not uncommon boast that he would return with an income of ten thousand pounds, there were scores who wore out their lives and wrecked their bodies and minds, and transmitted to their sons the sole legacy of a hopelessly inextinguishable debt.

When the West Indian system had itself all but collapsed of its own dead weight, and was given its finishing blows by the abolition of slavery and the modification of tariffs, the British Parliament came to its relief with a government land loan ostensibly designed to aid the planters. I am willing to advance the opinion that it was the great English factorage houses who really engineered the deal, and who were almost its sole beneficiaries. Of the millions of pounds thus advanced by the government, practically all but a pittance remained in England, for the amortization of ancient debts which otherwise would never have been cancelled.

Like the plantation slavery system, the West Indian factorage system, with various modifications, was transferred to the Southern colonies of America. It seems to have been the very corner-stone of large-scale, staple, slave-labor agriculture. When the Revolution destroyed the business of English factors, their places were taken by enterprising men in the more important Southern commercial towns. Some of these had been exporting agents and correspondents of English houses. Others were attracted to the business by the promise of large returns, and because it was from the first recognized as an eminently respectable and honorable form of employment for capital and brains; and the social prejudice against trade did not obtain against it.

The importance of the Southern factorage system developed with the growth of the cotton industry. Indigo planting disappeared with the destruction of the English bounty system by the Revolution. Tobacco culture was confined to a more or less restricted area, and

did not offer an inviting field for wide-spread and large-scale capitalistic enterprise. Rice, which took the place of indigo in South Carolina, became an important crop and had its own system of development, in which the factor played a considerable part. In Louisiana the sugar factor became as important a part in the commercial system, as he had been in that of the West Indies. But it was in cotton that the factorage system reached its greatest development, became most powerful, and flourished longest. Cotton was a crop ideally adapted to a capitalistic system of agriculture. It grew through a wide range of geographical area. Its non-perishable nature lent itself peculiarly to a system which required the concentration of its product at seaboard, at a time when transportation and warehouse facilities were poor, and rough handling, exposure, and long delays would have destroyed the value of any other agricultural commodity. It is therefore the cotton region which offers the student the largest promise of reward for investigation of the system and its effects and ramifications.

The functions of the Southern factor were the same as those of his English progenitor. But the Southern system had one feature not contained in the English. The business here developed relations between factor and client not possible with the West Indian oversea system. The relations between the cotton factor and planter were of the most intimate and confidential character, as close probably as was ever the case between business associates. The ties between them frequently were life-long, and their relations were of a social and personal as well as business nature. How far this close personal association affected plantation policy, it is not possible to say. But it is certain that the counsel and advice of the factor were frequently reflected in the planter's affairs. It was a relationship which often effected a close union of business interests and political, social, and economic policies between a large and dominantly influential body throughout the cotton-producing South, and the men who were the leading and dominant figures in the business and financial life of Southern cities. It also raised to the *n*th power the definite and tangible value of the moral hazard in business. It is not too much to say that the great factorage houses of the South looked quite as much to the character of a customer as to the securities he had to offer. Millions of dollars have been advanced by Southern factors upon the mere personal word of the planter, with no formal security at all, and with only a memorandum to witness the amounts involved. A unique basis of agricultural credit was established, which must be taken into account in interpreting such documentary evidence as

plantation and slave mortgages and other securities of record. Another manifestation of the personal equation was in the opportunities offered by the factorage system to men of little or no capital, usually of the overseer class, to embark in business for themselves. An overseer identified with the successful management of a plantation estate was often as well known to his employer's factor by reputation as the planter himself was personally. Such a one, who possessed the necessary initiative, had little difficulty in establishing a factorage connection on his own account. Many of the largest and most successful planters of the South were men who got their start in this way.

It is not to be supposed that there were no cases of conflicts of interest and of opposing policies between the planter and the factor classes. The business was of too great magnitude and its ramifications far too extensive for this not to have occurred. As in the case of the earlier English factors, it was a business of considerable hazard and it had to carry a corresponding burden. It has always been the misfortune of large-scale staple plantation enterprises—that is, those requiring large capital and a heavy labor equipment—that the vicissitudes to which they were subject tinctured them with something of both the nature and the spirit of games of chance. With the planter it has always been either a feast or a famine. In the very nature of things this chance had in some measure to be shared by the factor, and naturally the system developed a scale of charges which were correspondingly high. I do not know that there was much complaint at these charges. They were accepted as the price to be paid for a necessary accommodation. But when, as was often the case, a few years of adversity found the planter struggling under a burden of debt which was steadily increasing, it was natural that he should sometimes give utterance to the feeling that "in the fell clutch of circumstance" he was hopelessly harnessed to the factor's plow. On the other hand there were enough instances of abuse of confidence and credit on the planter's part; of the reckless squandering at Northern resorts and on European travel of funds furnished for purely business purposes; of neglect of their common interests, with resulting heavy losses to both, to make the factor feel that though his profits were many times greater than they were supposed to be, they would still be insufficient to balance the risks he ran. It was by no means a one-sided game.

We have seen that the factor furnished the planter with funds; that he acted as a commission merchant in the purchase of plantation supplies, and that he discharged the functions of an agent in selling

the plantation product. What were the charges for these services, and what were the characteristic features of the system, which differentiated it from any other relation of principal and agent? And what were its general economic tendencies and effects? The interest rate varied with times, places, and conditions. It probably ranged between eight and twelve per cent. It was usually charged only as funds were actually drawn, though in some instances it was computed on the face of the loan, regardless of the average time of its actual use by the borrower. There was also in some cases a customary brokerage fee of from one half of one per cent. to two and one half per cent. added to the interest charge. To the price of the goods, wares, and merchandise purchased for the planter was added a commission which varied according to custom from two to ten per cent. or more. The customary charge for selling the crop was a commission of two and one half per cent., but sometimes this was as high as four.

These were the only items of open profit to the factor in the transaction. But there were others which helped to make the business attractive, notwithstanding its hazards. In the early days cotton sales were effected through a broker who acted as a middleman between the factor and the resident agent of a foreign mill or merchant. To this broker was paid a commission of one half of one per cent., nominally borne by the mill agent. In practice and custom, however, one-half of this commission was paid by the factor and charged to the planter. This was supposed to be divided between the factor and the broker. The planter was taxed with various other charges, as freight, storage, insurance, drayage, weighing, sampling, mending, and repairing. These were returned on the account of sale to the planter at a uniform rate, fixed by custom or agreement, and were supposed to represent the actual amounts paid by the factor for the service rendered in behalf of the planter. As a matter of fact, custom early developed a system of rebates to the factor on practically all these charges. This seemed to be an inevitable incident of the control by the factor of large quantities of cotton to be warehoused, drayed, insured, compressed, and otherwise handled solely at his direction. Those who were engaged in such business at cotton ports naturally offered the factor the inducements of special rates and drawbacks in consideration of the heavy volume of business which he could divert to their hands.

The exaction of one of these exerted a particularly baneful influence upon the plantation system. This was the penalty commission feature of most advancing contracts between factor and planters, incident to the repayment of all loans in kind, rather than in money.

The fundamental consideration inducing extensions of credit under the factorage system was not the matter of interest on the funds advanced. This, indeed, was the least of such inducements. The very foundation of the system was the medium which it offered for the control and manipulation of large volumes of a great staple commodity holding a recognized position of prime importance in the commercial world. The planter's note, backed by his contract with the factor, with the latter's endorsement, could be rediscounted with the factor's correspondents in any financial centre in this country or abroad. The tremendous stocks of cotton accumulated in the factorage cities of the South, warehoused, insured, and controlled by the factor, furnished him a basis of credit unequalled by any other form of security the South had to offer. It was practically as convertible as the best forms of commercial paper. If cotton was king, the cotton factor was the power behind the throne. We do not need any documents to tell us that the inevitable consequence was the elevation of the mere volume of business—the naked number of bales of cotton grown by the planter and controlled by the factor—to a position of importance out of all true and proper economic relation to what should have been the primary considerations of cost and profit to the producer. The penalty commission was a simple expedient for stimulating the production of more bales of cotton. It was a proviso coupled to the agreement for paying the customary commission on sales, under which the planter bound himself to pay to the factor a certain sum per bale, sometimes ranging as high as four dollars, for each and every bale by which his actual production fell short of the stipulated number of bales which he agreed to ship. This was in addition to the agreement to plant so many acres in cotton, calculated to produce so many bales. Travellers and foreign observers of Southern conditions were accustomed to comment on the South's devotion to cotton, to the neglect of the principle of proper diversification, so essential to a permanently prosperous and well-balanced system of agriculture, and to attribute the trouble to slavery. Such foundation as there was for this criticism was in large measure due to the influences which we have suggested. Cotton was the only cash crop. It was moreover the only crop which could be used as a basis of credit. Every planter who was in debt fondly dreamed of the year when through a combination of a bumper yield and a fair price he would be enabled to throw off his shackles. But the only avenue of escape was through this happy combination, and it was too seldom realized. Even when a planter did finally grow independent the impulse to enlarge his un-

dertakings had become deep rooted and was apparently irresistible. There was a sort of atmospheric psychology in the situation which seemed to make a man forever dissatisfied with a stagnated sufficiency. He wanted more land and more slaves, which meant more cotton, and as more cotton was both a means and an end, the economic circle was thus easily established. But here again we have the personal equation. These men included in their ranks many who by inherent ability and force were as much captains of industry in their day and generation as were the cotton factors of the cities. Their activities simply found expression in expansion along lines normal to their period and environment, precisely as is the case in the industrial and financial world to-day. There need be no mystery about that phase of the matter.

In order to render absolute the factor's control of the entire crop, one of the cardinal features of the system was the requirement that every bale of cotton grown by the planter should be consigned to the factor. If the total crop were one thousand bales, and the first five hundred discharged the planter's debt, an exceedingly improbable supposition, the remaining five hundred bales must nevertheless go forward also. There were few, if any, agricultural lien laws in those days, but this requirement took their place. It also probably made their ultimate enactment less difficult, through common familiarity with the practical operation of their essential principle, which was a certain measure of control, by the financing agent, of the product grown through his assistance.

The broader economic effects of the factorage system would form in themselves alone an interesting and valuable field of inquiry. A primary incident was the concentration of Southern capital, and hence of its real wealth, in the few Southern cities which were its important factorage centres. Within the limitations of this paper, it would be useless to attempt even a casual consideration of this branch of the subject. But I am satisfied of the inaccuracy of the commonly accepted idea of ante-bellum Southern wealth as something naturally and essentially rural, as might be expected in a country whose sole business in popular estimation was that of agriculture.

One effect of the system was the retarding of the normal tendency toward the founding and developing of smaller urban communities, common even in an agricultural section. The factorage centres were enormous supply depots, from which were distributed to the interior South, through the factor in bulk, instead of through a local merchant by ordinary processes of retail trade, all the common

necessities, comforts, and conveniences of daily life. And it is a mistake to assume that I am here dealing with ancient history. The system outlived by many years the ante-bellum era, and within my memory, in the case of my own family, all the staple articles of domestic and plantation use were bought through my father's factor in New Orleans, and shipped four hundred miles by river, and then hauled by wagons twenty-odd miles further into the interior.

When interior urban development at last took place, it was naturally patterned after that of the seaboard factorage centres. Prosperous and influential factorage houses grew up at what became important interior river points. Here we had a repetition on a smaller scale of the accumulation of cotton and the concentration of capital and wealth which were the rule at seaboard. But this was a step in the direction of the diffusion, not of the break-up, of the system. These interior houses were in the nature of tributaries to the larger streams.

The beginning of the end of the seaboard system did not come until some years after the Civil War. The two most potent instrumentalities in its final dissolution were the railroads and the land-mortgage companies. The development of railroads made it possible for cotton to be shipped direct from the field of its production to that of its foreign or domestic consumption, which in turn made possible a real interior market. The advent of land-mortgage companies made possible a refunding process whereby the whole, or a large part, of a planter's obligations could be financed on a basis of the land alone. His current business could then be transferred on the security of a crop lien and personal property to smaller interior merchants and factors, whose capital, though limited as compared with the old institutions, had become large enough to meet the necessities of the business after the loan companies had assumed a large part of the burden. The country merchant had frequently become a factor through natural gradations, and he was at hand to take care of smaller business at first, and gradually to extend the field of his operations. Largely from his ranks was developed the country banker, who was an indispensable feature in the slow process of modifying and finally revolutionizing the ancient system. The country factor did business along the same general lines as his city prototype. But where he has taken over the factor's business at all, and this he has largely done, the country banker has practically abandoned the last vestige of the old system. He lends on the same security as the factor, but the business is on the same basis as any other commercial transaction. The railroad and the country mer-

chant and factor, the country compress and the country bank, have been followed by the country buyer, who furnishes the last link in the chain between raw cotton production and consumption. The elimination of the entrepreneur has by no means been accomplished, but the industry has been relieved of a large part of the load which it carried for the greater portion of the first century of its existence. Even in the remote interior a planter can to-day gin the cotton which yesterday was in the field, and to-morrow receive a check for it from a buyer who will consign it from the planter's platform to its destination at Fall River, Bremen, or Liverpool. Within the span of my personal experience, I have seen the time when a similar transaction would require from two to six months for its consummation, with the intervention of a dozen different agencies of transportation and trade.

Alfred Holt Stone.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

The Reform of Josiah and its Secular Aspects

That religion is the most important element in Hebrew history is a truism which none will dispute. That no element in this history has a value save in terms of religion is not a truism nor is it universally advocated, yet it is a fallacy underlying much of our biblical research. Thanks to the religious prestige of the Old Testament, its non-religious contents have directly influenced the history of later peoples along legal, political, and social lines. Without denying the supreme importance of the Hebrew religion, a fresh working over of the history from a purely secular standpoint has a distinct value of its own. Even the religion will be better understood when we more clearly realize the secular environment in which it developed.[1]

An excellent illustration of the distortion caused by a purely religious standpoint is found in the Reform of Josiah.[2] Its date, 621 B. C., has come to be, in the eyes of modern biblical students, the central point in Hebrew history. The Book of the Law found at this time in the temple was undoubtedly the book of Deuteronomy.[3]

[1] This note is a by-product of studies which seek a new starting-point for the source-criticism of the Old Testament in an investigation of the passages added later than the earliest Greek translation. *Cf.* "Source Study and the Biblical Text", *Amer. Jour. Semitic Languages,* XXX. 1 ff.; "The Earliest Book of Kings", *ibid.,* XXXI. 169 ff.

[2] II Kings xxii f. The account has been much interpolated in late times, *cf. Amer. Jour. Semitic Languages,* XXXI. 190. For proof, note the use of the shorter and later form Hilkiah for Hilkiahu in xxii. 8b–12; the three essential variants, with others of less importance, in the usually so fixed Massoretic Text; the numerous cases where even the late Greek translation of Theodotion has better readings than the Hebrew. The most important Hebrew variant, "Levites" for "Prophets", is another case of correction from Chronicles.

[3] Or rather the core of Deuteronomy. Such passages as iv. 27 and xxviii. 36 ff., for example, are clearly post-exilic; omission from Greek manuscripts sometimes shows a post-Septuagintal date. That the original Deuteronomy was considerably shorter is also proved by a Hebrew papyrus fragment of pre-Massoretic character (S. A. Cook, *Proc. Soc. Biblical Archaeology,* XXV. 34 ff.; *Expository Times,* XIV. 200 ff.) which frequently gives us the originals of Greek variant readings, including one entire verse hitherto considered a Greek interpolation. It also proves that Deut. v. 22–vi. 3 is a late Hebrew insertion. We should especially note that in this interpolated passage we find a triple use of the phrase "commandment, statutes, ordinances", already known as the most characteristic expression of the sections added to Kings in post-Septuagintal times.

With its date thus fixed, we have a standard by which to judge, not only the age of the various documents in our Old Testament, but the entire religious and secular development of the earlier history.

Undoubtedly the code of law then introduced was better adapted to the more complex civilization, undoubtedly it marked a great advance in ethical feeling and a growing kindliness. Nor can we deny that centring the cult in Jerusalem did much to make more definite a monotheism already developing from the idea that no patriotic Hebrew could worship any god but Yahweh.

Yet we shall largely misunderstand this central event in Hebrew history if we neglect its secular aspect. Centralization of the cult in Jerusalem was only one phase of a political centralization which had long been in process of development. The tendency toward union had already appeared in the time of the Judges and reached its height under David. That astute ruler took for his capital Jerusalem, a foreign and therefore pagan city, with no Hebrew associations save those connected with himself. In this city, an upstart in the sight of old cult-centres like Hebron and Bethel, Solomon built his temple. If earlier generations of scholars overemphasized its glory, those of the present day have minimized its very real importance. Small as it was, it was the royal chapel, attached to the king's palace,[4] and always under the direct control of the ruler who could sacrifice in person, high priest and king in one.[5] Changes in religion, whether approved by the editor of Kings or not, are always attributed to the monarch alone. The funds of the temple are always at his disposal.[6] It is the ruler who checks cases of priestly peculation.[7] Even as late as the time of Ahaz, the king inquired in person of Yahweh by means of a special altar in the temple.[8]

Added to this tendency toward centralization which resulted from the royal character of the shrine, an influence of a more purely secular character should be noted. Already David had endeavored to form a close union of the tribes and the rebellions of Absalom and of Sheba marked the reaction against it. Solomon attempted to destroy the old tribal divisions and to bring his subjects under royal officials directly controlled by the central power. The revolt of Jeroboam marked the end of this effort. But with the fall of the

4 *Cf.* I Kings vii; II Kings xi. 9.

5 I Kings ix. 25; II Chron. xxvi. 16.

6 I Kings xv. 18; II Kings xii. 18; xvi. 8; xviii. 15.

7 II Kings xii. 4 ff.; *cf.* xxii. 3 ff.

8 II Kings xvi. 15.—Does v. 18, "from the face of the king of Assyria", hide a reference to worship of the King of Assyria and of Ashur, the deified Assyrian nation, within the temple precincts?

northern kingdom, this tendency became again dominant in Judah.

It is true that, in certain respects, the reform represents the victory of the Jerusalem aristocracy over the country elements. It is true that the book of Deuteronomy contemplated a king who was by no means free from control by that priestly aristocracy.[9] But, whatever the origin of the book, it is clear that the actual reform was the work of Josiah alone. It was the king's order to use priestly funds for temple repair, neglected by the religious authorities, which led to the "discovery" of the Law. It was the king who carried out such demands of the Law as he saw fit. If Yahweh was now supreme in the land, so was his vicegerent the king; if Jerusalem was now the unique centre of Yahweh worship, no less was it the sole capital of the Hebrews. It is no accident that Jeremiah, the most profoundly religious mind of the period, opposed the introduction of the Law in these words, "I spake not with your fathers . . . concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices"; "the false pen of the scribe hath wrought falsely."[10]

But the strongest argument against a purely religious character for the reform is its effect upon religion. That in the long run it was an aid to the monotheism rapidly developing among the higher classes is true, for a single sanctuary demanded a single deity. But there was another side. The country priests were not, to be sure, left entirely deserted. Those who wished might come up to Jerusalem, be supported at state expense, and sink into dependents of the priestly aristocracy. Few seem to have come.[11] The irregular priests of the Judaean high places were burned to death[12] while even more severe was the punishment meted out to the priests and high places at Bethel in the northern kingdom.[13]

Far worse was the condition of the peasant. So far as authority could secure that result, he had been robbed of his religion. It is only too true that this worship was far from ideal. "On every high hill and under every green tree" were performed those rites in which sexual impurity found a place, and there were abuses connected with the local shrines which had long since invited the thunders of the prophets. But all was not unclean. At Hebron and at Beersheba had lingered the traditions of a loved and glorious past, when Abraham had been the friend of Yahweh. If the worship of the national god Yahweh under the form of a calf at Bethel had

[9] Deut. xvii. 14 ff.
[10] Jer. vii. 22; viii. 8.
[11] II Kings xxiii. 9.
[12] So the Greek on xxiii. 15.
[13] *Ibid.*, xxiii. 15 ff.

provoked the indignation of advanced thinkers, few could forget that here it was that the hero Jacob had seen the ladder. If the closing of the shrines at Hebron and Beersheba meant a complete break with the past, the desecration of the altar at Bethel by burning upon it human bones was pure sacrilege. To many a thinking and pious Hebrew, the "reform" of Josiah must have seemed the utter negation of all that was best in the nation's past.

Religion had been a vital part of the peasant's life. When he slaughtered a sheep, it was a sacrifice to Yahweh. When he ate his simple meal, Yahweh might be present with him. When he brought his first fruits to the local sanctuary, he "rejoiced before the face of Yahweh". The priests were of his own class. If his asses were lost, the local seer told him where they were, and the cost was not great. The "man of God", scarcely more than a wandering dervish, ate his simple fare and blessed him.

Now all was changed. His priests had been slaughtered, or were far away, dependents in the distant city. His first fruits were eaten by men he knew not face to face. Only in Jerusalem could he be religious. That meant an absence of days from home, a tramp on foot under the blazing sun and over the unspeakable trails of Judah, and expense which, however small, was too great for his modest means. Arrived in Jerusalem, he must worship with utter strangers. The union of the official religion with the social life of the village was broken and broken forever.

Soon after, Josiah was killed in battle and barely a third of a century elapsed before Jerusalem fell and the temple was destroyed. The little group of deported leaders, exiled in Mesopotamia or Babylonia, might look back with longing to the temple in Jerusalem which had been the centre of their power as well as of their affections. A few might even leave the fleshpots of Babylonia and go back to their desolated homes. The peasants who had not been deported had lost touch with the official religion. Connection had been destroyed by the "reform", there had been no time for the temple to take its place. The peasant became a "pagan", one of the "people of the land" as they were stigmatized by those who arrogated to themselves the name of "Pious".

When at last the dispersion of the Jews throughout the Mediterranean world had made clear, even to the most "Pious", the impossibility of confining worship to the little mountain city, and the synagogue had been developed to meet the need, the peasant was in large part alienated from the official religion. Some had married

Philistine women,[14] some had mingled with the Assyrian captives and formed the Samaritan people,[15] some had accepted the Hellenistic religions.[16] The remainder were lukewarm in their faith and doubtful in their orthodoxy. Later, some became Christians and more became Muslims after the Conquest. To-day, they worship Allah in name, but the religion which influences their lives is the religion of their fathers, in no small part identical with that which Josiah and his advisers attempted to stamp out. That they were once called Hebrews, they never suspect. All opportunity for influence by the advanced thinkers among the Hebrews was lost when the "reform" of Josiah snapped the connection between the official cult and the daily life of the peasant.[17]

A. T. Olmstead.

James I. and Witchcraft

There are several pieces of direct testimony that prove, beyond the possibility of doubt, that James I., throughout his English reign, prided himself on discovering imposture in cases of alleged bewitching or demoniacal possession.[1] To those that have already been cited, may now be added the evidence of John Gee, in a sermon at Paul's Cross in 1624.[2] Gee gives an account, which he has "learned within these few dayes", of a young woman in London "who pretendeth to be vexed and *possessed by a Devill*".[3] He concludes his story with the significant remark: "I leave the examination of this to him that sits on our *Throne*, his *Maiestie*, who hath a happy gift in discovery of such *Impostures*."[4]

G. L. Kittredge.

[14] Neh. xiii. 23 ff.

[15] II Kings xvii. 24 ff.; Neh. xiii. 4 ff.

[16] II Macc. iv. 7 ff.

[17] Much of this paper is the direct result of days and nights spent among the peasants in their fields, on the road, and in their huts.

[1] *Studies in the History of Religions presented to Crawford Howell Toy* (New York, 1912), pp. 53–64.

[2] *Hold Fast: a Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse upon Sunday being the XXXI. of October, Anno Domini 1624* (London, 1624).

[3] P. 45.

[4] P. 46.

Casting Votes of the Vice-Presidents, 1789–1915

Reckoning from April 21, 1789, the day of John Adams's inaugural as Vice-President, to March 4, 1915, there appear to have been 179 instances of the use of the casting vote by the Vice-President in the Senate.[1] No attempt has hitherto been made to gather them together. All are of course recorded in the official journals of the Senate. A few have been recorded in connection with the Senate's exercise of its executive functions. As a rule, however, they have come with greater frequency (and usually unexpectedly) in the course of the Senate's proceedings on legislative matters. Of the great majority, little that is significant could be written. A small number, gaining contemporary comment because of crucial bearings on some variety of measures of a partizan nature, must always retain historic interest.

The following classification, though not arranged quite in accordance with logic or in subdivisions mutually exclusive, may yet serve as the basis for brief comment:[2]

I. Executive Functions:	i. Nominations	13
	ii. Treaties	3
II. Legislative Functions:	i. Elections of officers and questions of organization	7
	ii. Procedure	39
	iii. Bills and resolutions:	
	a. General public	91
	b. Local	5
	c. Private	21
Total		179

Where a two-thirds vote is essential for ratification, as in the case of treaties, obviously the Vice-President can have no direct influence on the final question of agreement. The subject "Treaties" (I, ii), it should accordingly be explained, concerns three votes cast on the same day (March 25, 1840), by means of which Vice-President R. M. Johnson was enabled to promote the proclamation of a treaty ratified by the Senate two years earlier (1838) with the Six Nations. The votes under "Procedure" (II, ii) were occasionally of incidental consequence. Several votes classified here were actually recorded, it may be added, while the Senate was in executive session.[3] But,

[1] Adams, 29; Jefferson, 3; Burr, 3; Clinton, 11; Gerry, 8; Tompkins, 5; Calhoun, 28; Van Buren, 4; R. M. Johnson, 14; Dallas, 19; Fillmore, 3; Breckinridge, 10; Hamlin, 7; Colfax, 13; Wilson, 1; Wheeler, 5; Arthur, 3; Morton, 4; Stevenson, 2; Hobart, 1; Sherman, 4; Marshall, 2.

[2] In devising this classification, I have been aided by Messrs. J. David Thompson and Ernest Bruncken, of the Library of Congress.

[3] *Executive Journals of the Senate*, under March 8, 1848, February 28, 1861, March 17, 1862, and January 31, 1879.

taken together, the votes under this subdivision do not lend themselves to separate consideration. "Local Bills" (II, iii, b) and "Private Bills" (II, iii, c) have so slight an historic interest as to be virtually negligible.

I. There has been no casting vote touching the subject of nominations since Vice-President Hamlin on March 17, 1862, used his right to vote for a postponement of the nomination of Edwin D. Morgan as major-general of volunteers. This was merely a matter of procedure and had no measurable effect upon the final ratification of the appointment a month later.[4] Almost all the votes in this class were used in conformity to the wishes of various Presidents for the purpose of promoting the claims of nominees to offices. Twice, however, in the hands of Vice-President Calhoun the casting ballot served effectively as a weapon against President Jackson, for Calhoun was able first (January 13, 1832) to halt the nomination of Martin Van Buren as minister to England and finally (January 25) to defeat it. The incidents of these votes were of peculiar interest inasmuch as Van Buren was at the time in London acting as our minister on a recess commission, and his rejection helped to make him Vice-President. Moreover it is altogether probable that Calhoun's partizans in the Senate provided him with the opportunity which he sought thus to assert his spite against Jackson.

II. In this general division, all votes of special consequence fall within the two subdivisions (i) and (iii, a).

(i.) As early as December 14, 1829, Calhoun determined in a divided Senate (21 to 21) the election of a chaplain. This vote passed without comment. Exactly the same sort of election was settled—the Senate dividing 30 to 30—by Vice-President Fillmore on January 9, 1850. But the question arose as to the Vice-President's power to act in such a case. Calhoun, Clay, Berrien, and some other Senators of experience discussed the subject, but approved the action of Fillmore which had behind it the earlier precedent.

On November 28, 1877, Vice-President Wheeler cast a vote favoring the motion to consider a report of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections in the case of William Pitt Kellogg of Louisiana. Although this vote did not directly determine the question of admitting to Senate membership in the matter of a disputed seat, it led the way to an intelligent, though inconclusive, discussion of the question of the Vice-President's right to cast his vote in such an issue. Senator Allen G. Thurman of Ohio argued vigorously against the supposed right of a Vice-President to have a vote upon the question of Senate membership. Is the Vice-President, he asked,

[4] April 15.

"a part of the House when it comes to judge of the elections, qualifications, and returns of its members? It seems to me to say that he is, is to say that the House cannot decide that question the sole right to decide which is in the House".[5] Senator Edmunds of Vermont on the other side of the issue believed that the Vice-President might lawfully cast his vote when Senate opinions were evenly balanced even over the question of possible membership. And Vice-President Wheeler took occasion to voice "no doubt of his right to vote in all cases in which the Senate is equally divided". Nevertheless, it still remains true that no Vice-President has yet been able by a vote to determine the question of admitting to membership in the Senate.

Under this subdivision belong the three casting votes of Vice-President Arthur which came early in the short but highly sensational extra session of the Senate, March 4–May 20, 1881. The Democrats at the opening of the session held a majority of votes, as they had done in the Senate for several preceding years. They were intent upon organizing the standing committees at once and proceeding with the business of nominations and treaties for which the Senate had been specially summoned. In view of the death (February 24) of the Republican Senator Matthew H. Carpenter of Wisconsin and the withdrawal to accept cabinet places under Garfield of Senators Blaine, Windom of Minnesota, and Samuel J. Kirkwood of Iowa, the Democrats were apparently not much disturbed over the question of holding control of the Senate organization. But the Republican minority under peculiarly able and experienced leadership began at the outset a determined opposition for the purpose of securing the standing committees: for a full fortnight it filibustered and delayed business. During this period it secured the good-will of two Senators of independent leanings: Senator David Davis of Illinois, who had acted usually with the Democrats, and Senator William Mahone, recently chosen from Virginia on a local issue and known as a "Readjuster". When William P. Frye of Maine arrived in Washington to take Blaine's vacant seat, the moment for action—March 18—was seen to have come. For days Senator G. H. Pendleton of Ohio had tried to obtain the Senate's consent to the Democratic plan of organization of the standing committees. When the vote on this plan was called for, it stood 37 to 37. Vice-President Arthur's ballot marked its defeat. Within a few minutes the Republicans put forward their organization plan—the so-called Anthony resolution—and won by exactly the same sort of vote, Arthur again settling the issue. While the Vice-President's third vote of March 24 was a

[5] *Congressional Record*, 45 Cong., 1 sess., VI. 737.

mere incident in dilatory procedure, it was delivered during the second phase of the struggle which ultimately failed, the attempt of the Republicans to gain sufficient strength to overturn the officers of the Senate.

(iii, a.) In this subdivision, casting votes have arisen on diverse occasions. In the first sixty years of our government, there were three such occasions that are particularly well known and have often been the subjects of historical comment. Within recent years such occasions have been comparatively rare; but one of these—that marked by the so-called Bristow Amendment (June, 1911)—deserves attention.

John Adams's first vote of July 18, 1789, cast in a balanced Senate (9 to 9) for the purpose of establishing the President's right to remove an officer without consulting the body which must originally have given its consent to the appointment, is probably still as remarkable a vote in the long series as can be found. It determined a principle that, although not undisputed and even for a time beclouded (1867–1887), is to-day a well-recognized basis for justifying the so-called power of removal. On February 20, 1811, Vice-President Clinton, acting in accordance with his duty (as he conceived it) strictly to construe the letter of the Constitution, cast a vote which killed a measure designed to renew the charter and privileges of Hamilton's first Bank of the United States. On July 28, 1846, Vice-President G. M. Dallas cast two telling votes: the first saved the so-called Walker tariff bill from falling into the hands of a special committee; the second sent it summarily to its third reading and accordingly assured its course to President Polk and the statute-book.

All these votes affected, either immediately or remotely, large interests. The three men responsible for them—Adams, Clinton, Dallas—each addressed the Senate for the purpose of justifying their votes. On only one other occasion (Tompkins, January 21, 1819) is there record of a speech from a Vice-President justifying a casting vote. If one other casting vote of conspicuous moment can be found in the early days, it was probably that of John Adams when, on April 28, 1794, he opposed effectively the third reading of a bill to suspend British imports. Had such a bill become law, it might have rendered abortive the mission of John Jay, and perhaps have brought on war with England.[6]

On three occasions within recent years the casting vote has been the subject of comment. Two of these may be at once disposed of. The single casting vote of Vice-President Hobart on February 14, 1899, eight days after the Senate had ratified the treaty with Spain,

[6] *Works* of John Adams, I. 457.

defeated the so-called Bacon Amendment, a careful formulation designed by the Senator from Georgia as a declaration of national policy toward the Philippines. With respect to a liberal policy it went a trifle further than the McEnery Resolution which it was designed to supplement. Hobart's vote recorded the Vice-President as in sympathy with the so-called Imperialist section of his party.[7] Almost exactly twelve years later (February 2, 1911) Vice-President Sherman cast three votes within the remarkably short space of half an hour. The first two of these were interesting as revealing about thirteen Republicans ("Insurgents") aligning with the Democrats in opposition to an administration measure, the ocean-mail subsidy bill. The absence of a new Democratic Senator (Clarence W. Watson of West Virginia) from his seat at the time of voting was widely commented upon, as was the fact that Senator Lorimer of Illinois, whose right to a seat had not been determined, had voted with the administration Republicans. The third vote was merely a matter of procedure, and adjourned the Senate.

The fourth (and last) casting vote of Sherman, on June 12, 1911, delivered in a divided Senate (44 to 44), forced the adoption, into an amendment to the Constitution providing for election of Senators by direct vote, of an amendment formulated by Senator Bristow of Kansas. Bristow's amendment introduced a clause which retained for the federal government the power to supervise senatorial elections. It was carried by one vote, whereas the entire amendment had to be adopted—as it was—by the necessary two-thirds majority. The situation was altogether peculiar in Senate annals. It brought impressively forward the significance of the casting vote, and led the next day (June 13) to a long discussion of the casting ballot, which was directed by Senator Bacon of Georgia. Bacon's viewpoint may be best indicated in his own language. He said:

> My proposition is that as to matters which do not relate to the ordinary business of the Senate, matters which do not relate to measures of legislation by Congress or to reciprocal or common business of the two Houses, or a matter which does not relate to any particular proceeding of the Senate, the Vice-President, not being a member of this body, has not the right to vote . . . the passage of a resolution proposing to the legislatures of the States the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution is not an act of legislation . . . . it must receive the affirmative vote of the requisite number prescribed in each House. But it has not the effect of law. It is simply the presentation of a proposition to the

[7] For the Bacon Amendment, see *Journal of the Senate*, 55 Cong., 3 sess. (1898–1899), p. 119, McEnery Resolution in *Congressional Record*, 55 Cong., 3 sess., XXXII. 1479; James A. LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines* (1914), II. 10–15.

tribunal which is to determine it, which is, at last, the legislatures of the States.[8]

Inasmuch as the President has nothing whatever to do with the process of an amendment to the Constitution, why, asked Senator Bacon, should the Vice-President have anything to do with the process? Senator W. J. Stone of Missouri, on the other hand, conceding that the vote might have been improperly cast, reminded the Senate that the vote came while the matter was in committee of the whole, and that at a later stage the two-thirds vote of the Senate had really terminated the issue.[9] Nothing was settled, for the discussion, coming the day after the vote, induced no reconsideration of the vote. But the discussion was sufficiently extensive and thoughtful to be ranked with that earlier discussion in November, 1877, on a somewhat different phase of the same general theme.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

[8] *Congressional Record*, 62 Cong., 1 sess., XLVII., pt. II., pp. 1949–1950.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 1957.

DOCUMENTS

Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780–1782

Part II.

The letters from Lafayette to Luzerne which follow are, with a single exception, of the year 1781. So well known are the military events of that year, especially those of the Virginia campaign which culminated in the fall of Yorktown, that it has not been deemed necessary to review them. It may, however, be worth while to indicate, in outline, Lafayette's part in them, the more so as the letters leave much to be understood. It will be remembered that the preceding letters left Lafayette, in October, 1780, in command of the Light Infantry Division of Washington's army. He remained with the army until it went into winter quarters at New Windsor, and then went to Philadelphia, where he spent the better part of December. He returned to headquarters early in January, 1781, stopping on the way because of the revolt of the Pennsylvania line, of which his letters contain some account. In the latter part of February he was placed in command of a detachment designed to operate against Arnold, who was now in Virginia. He reached the Head of Elk on March 3, and Annapolis on March 10, where he left his troops and proceeded to Yorktown, hoping to have news of the French fleet which was to co-operate with him. This fleet, however, had a disadvantageous action off the Virginia capes and failed to enter the Chesapeake, whereupon Lafayette was forced to bring his expedition back to the Head of Elk. Here he received Washington's orders of April 6 to reinforce Greene, and promptly starting south, he reached Richmond on April 29 in time to save the city from Phillips.

From that time until the arrival of the allied troops in September Lafayette was in command in Virginia. Unable to prevent the junction of Cornwallis with Phillips's army, which took place at Petersburg on May 20, he was obliged to retire before Cornwallis's superior forces until he could effect a junction with Wayne near the Rapidan on June 10. Cornwallis now turned towards Portsmouth followed by Lafayette. No general engagement took place and Lafayette took his army into summer quarters at Malvern Hill. In August the fleet of de Grasse arrived and in September the allied armies under Washington and Rochambeau were on hand and the Yorktown

campaign, properly speaking, was begun. After the surrender of Cornwallis, Lafayette obtained a leave of absence and returned to France.

The letters here printed are supplemented by those which Lafayette wrote to Washington, printed in Sparks' *Letters to Washington*. The best account of Lafayette's activities during 1781 is of course to be found in the biography by Charlemagne Tower.

WALDO G. LELAND.

XXIX.

TRENTON ce 4 janvier six he.[1]

Ma gazette sera peu favorable, Monsieur le chevalier, et les insurgens sont plus endiablés que jamais.[2] Toute la ligne est rassemblée á Princetown ou ils arriverent hier au soir, et ou ils ont sejourné aujourdhuy. On leur a envoyé une deputation de Trenton pour les prier de ne pas passer dans cette ville: quelques personnes croïent qu'ils y viendront demain; ils ont cependant dit qu'ils resteroient à Princetown comme un point intermediaire d'ou si la Milice faisoit mine de les attaquer ils pourroïent se rendre à Newyork après avoir mis le païs à feu et à sang sans distinction d'age ni de sexe; mais si on les laisse tranquille, ils disent qu'ils ne passeront point aux ennemis. Ils marchent dans un ordre admirable, ont des commandants, des piquets, et tout ce qui peut maintenir chés eux la sureté et le bon ordre. Le G'al Waïne et les C'els Butler et Stewart[3] sont avec eux comme des especes d'otages, avec une garde à leur poste, et ne peuvent parler qu'à des Committés de sergeants envoyés pour traiter, auxquels en revenant on ôte tout commandement de peur de corruption. Ce qu'il y a de pis c'est que les sentinelles et piquets ont ordre de ne laisser passer aucun officier Continental, et que personne n'a la liberté de haranguer les soldats. Tout se passe par Committés, et cette derniere precaution prouve que les emissaires Anglois sont determinés à prevenir tout effet que pourroit avoir sur eux ou l'influence ou l'eloquence des particuliers.

Nous envoïons au president du Congrés une copie des propositions faites par eux et des reponses du G'al Waïne.[4] Nous les avons eues par le Commissaire Stewart[5] qui à ce titre a été receu parmi eux, et qui a causé non seulement avec le Committé de sergeants mais même *par hasard* avec une foule de soldats qui est venu l'entourer.

Lord Stirling[6] alloit à eux avec quelques autres personnes; mais d'aprés l'assurance d'etre tués par ce monde là que leur a donné le Commissaire Stewart, ils n'ont pas cru devoir s'avancer et ont retourne sur leurs pas; quant à nous, il faut en courir les risques, et ce soir nous nous avancerons à six mille d'eux, pour y arriver demain matin. On a fort taché

[1] Fols. 192–194 v. A. L.

[2] This refers of course to the well-known revolt of the Pennsylvania line. Full accounts and documents are in *Pennsylvania Archives*, second series, XI. 631–674, and in Charles J. Stillé, *Anthony Wayne and the Pennsylvania Line*, pp. 241–262.

[3] Colonel Richard Butler and Colonel Walter Stewart.

[4] The proposals of the committee of sergeants and the reply of Wayne, both of January 4, are printed in *Penn. Arch., loc. cit.*

[5] Charles Stewart, major and commissary general of issues of the Continental army.

[6] William Alexander, Lord Stirling, major-general in the Continental army.

de nous effraïer, mais je ne crois pas le danger si grand qu'ils le disent à beaucoup près.

Les soldats ont parlé à Stewart de tous les generaux et dans les termes peu amicals, il n'y a que moi pour lequel ils ont avoué avoir un fond d'amitié; mais ils me trouvent trop severe sur l'article de la discipline. Stewart dit qu'ils tueront St. Clair, mais à ces eclaboussures près il ne croïent pas qu'ils me touchent autrement que pour me faire prisonnier. Leur avant garde est commandée par des chefs de complot; mais coute qui coute je lâcherai mon discours.

Je n'ai rien entendu dire du general; les officiers de Pensilvanie se sont rassemblés sur les derrieres. On met la milice sur pied; je prêche la paix, et à moins d'etre sûr de les pouvoir tüer tous si je veux, je ne tirerois pas un seul coup de fusil.

Ne mandés rien en france de tout ces faits; attendés une determination qui ne peut pas etre retardée; si par bonheur tout ceci s'arrangeoït, il seroit crüel de perdre là bas la reputation de l'armée. Vous savés neanmoins, Monsieur la chevalier, que la ligne de Pensilvanie, n'est pas composée comme les autres de soldats citoïens. On dit que les autres joindront, mais je vous reponds du contraire sur ma tête; ce qui peut être ce soir n'est pas un pari si cher qu'à l'ordinaire. Serieusement, Monsieur le chevalier, je ne crois pas le danger si grand qu'on le dit, et je serois bien faché que votre amitié prit des inquietudes sur la foi des messieurs qui ont causé cette après midi avec les insurgents, et qui chargent le tableau.

Dans ce moment Mde. Craig[7] arrive au Concert, et moi je pars pour la petite ville de *Maidenhead* que malgré son joli nom je quitterai demain matin pour me presenter seul si je puis, ou du moins avec St. Clair et Proctor[8] sans Aides de Camp au milieu de ces messieurs, et voir s'ils veulent interrompre mon passage ou mon eloquence. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, mes compliments à Mr. de Marbois à Deux Ponts[9] et à tous ces messieurs.

Point de nouvelles des ennemis; il y a cependant passé des deserteurs; en se rendant à Trenton chés le Commissaire Stewart Mr. de Deux Ponts pourra savoir ou nous sommes.

Nous apprenons à l'instant que les propositions du G'al Waïne ont été rejettées; que les insurgents comptent venir ici demain, et par consequent nous les trouverons en marche. Tout ce qu'on dit ne m'empêche pas de croire que nous serons soufferts par eux.

XXX.

Morristown ce 7 janvier 1781[10]

Vous etes surement curieux, Monsieur le chevalier, de savoir les detaïls de cette malheureuse revolte; je vais vous communiquer ici ce que j'en ai pu apprendre, et ce que j'en ai vu moi-même.[11]

7 Madame Craig was the wife of John Craig, a Philadelphia merchant. She had been educated abroad and spoke French and Italian fluently, and her house was much frequented by the French officers. See *Penn. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, II. 2.

8 Colonel Thomas Proctor of the Continental artillery?

9 Probably the elder of the two brothers, Christian, Marquis de Deux-Ponts, colonel of the regiment of Royal-Deux-Ponts.

10 Fols. 198–199 v. A. L.

11 For General St. Clair's account of this visit of Lafayette and himself to the insurgents see his letter to Washington of January 7, 1781, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 195.

La ligne de Pensilvanie etoit depuis longtemps mecontente, et il faut avoüer que plusieurs d'eux ont droit de se plaindre de l'interpretation donnée à leurs engagements, ainsi que de la maniere dont quelques officiers ont receu leurs representations. Ce grief et quelques autres circonstances ont donné lieux aux deserteurs et emissaires anglois de fabriquer cette mutinerie. Les detaïls qu'on vous en a donnés sont assés justes; j'y ajouterai seulement que le C'l Stewart ayant conduit une partie de son regiment à charger les mutins, en a été abandonné au moment ou les bayonnetes se croisoïent et tout le monde s'est tourné contre lui. Les officiers de Pensilvanie ont vraiment couru beaucoup de danger à cette occasion.

Ma lettre dattée de Trenton vous aura donné quelque idée de l'organisation de ces Messieurs; mais elle n'a pu qu'exagerer nos dangers personels par ce qu'elle etoit ecrite après une conversation alarmante avec le Commissaire G'al Mr. Stewart, le gouverneur,[12] et lord Stirling. Les deux dragons de Philadelphie vous auront dit comment on nous a receus et comment on nous a renvoyés; je vais encore vous en repeter les circonstances les plus interessantes.

D'aprés les lugubres predictions de ces messieurs nous attendions une très mauvaise reception; mais ayant trouvé plusieurs bas officiers et soldats hors la ville, nous leur demandames la raison de tout ce fracas. Ils nous repondirent avec un embarras et une honte qui nous parut de bon augure, et nous avancames jusqu'au sentinelle qui nous arrêtat et nous fit reconnoitre fort en regle. Ayant passé outre, je pris la liberté de donner un ordre au bas officier de la garde qui me dit qu'il n'y manqueroit pas. Delà on nous conduisit au Committé de sergeants, lesquels nous receurent fort respectueusement. Nous leur parlames et ils nous montrerent ce qui avoit été ecrit entre le G'al Waïne et eux. Delà nous allames chés le g'al Waïne, et nous y vimes à plusieurs reprises les chefs qu'ils se sont donnés.

J'ai vu que les malheureux etoient guidés par une bande d'emissaires anglois, ou de sergeants attachés à leur nouveau pouvoir qui ne vouloïent pas souffrir que l'on allat à leurs soldats. Cette forme de Committé que le g'al Waïne a cru devoir proposer ôte toute possibilité de parler à la Multitude; c'est toujours au Committé qu'ils vous renvoïent, ainsi qu'à leur commencement de traité. D'ailleurs ils sont organisés comme une petite armée; ils ont leurs generaux, leurs colonels etc, et jusqu'à ce qu'on les divise, il n'y a pas moyen d'en faire une multitude sans ordre, ce qui dans mon opinion particuliere me paraitroit l'etat desirable.

Nous avions l'esperance de detacher le Rgt. du C'l Stewart, et d'engager les autres à se porter sur Trenton, ce qui ne plait pas à leurs sergeants, mais nous paroit avantageux afin de les eloigner des ennemis; ils nous ont juré que si les anglois sortoïent ils viendroïent nous joindre ici pour les combattre avec le g'al Waïne à leur tête. Je le crois assés, mais dans l'autre cas, comme il en faudra venir à la force, il est dangereux de les garder si prés d'ici.

Nos affaires etoïent en assés bon train lorsque le committé de sergeants nous a fait dire que la ligne se plaignoit de voir tant d'officiers et craignoïent qu'ils ne tramassent quelque chose contre eux. Ils nous conseilloïent de faire une *prompte retraite* crainte *of evil consequences.* Un autre message ne nous donnoit qu'une heure et demie; je n'etois pas

[12] President Reed of Pennsylvania, frequently referred to in correspondence as "governor".

nommé dans tout cela, mais tout le monde partant, et tout le monde convenant de l'impossibilité de parler aux soldats et de traiter autrement que de la maniere etablie entre le g'al Waïne et eux nous avons quitté Princetown laissant ces trois messieurs qu'on peut regarder comme prisonniers; mais determinés et organisés comme ils le sont, je suis ettonné qu'ils ne nous aïent pas tous gardés.

En venant ici nous avons trouvé sur la route beaucoup de soldats, et les avons engagé a retourner sur leur pas. Il y en a un parti d'environ trente, ou mon bavardage a pensé ceder aux instances de quelques mutins, mais aprés beaucoup d'effusions de coeur, et de belles paroles, ils ont enfin consenti à retourner à leurs huttes. Je souhaitte que le rum ou l'influence des chefs de meute ne changent pas leur resolution. Tous ces gens-là me disent qu'ils me suivroïent partout si j'avois besoin d'eux ou contre les ennemis ou contre ma sureté personnelle, qu'ils mouroïent jusqu'au dernier sous mes ordres, mais que je ne sais pas tout ce qu'ils ont souffert; qu'ils se feront rendre justice par leur païs; qu'ils verront une deputation de l'assemblée, qu'ils acheveront leur traité avec le g'al Waïne, et qu'alors ils reviendront à Morristown. Mais leurs demandes sont extravagantes, et d'aïlleurs il paroit difficile de consentir à un pardon general.

Il reste encore quelques hommes dans les huttes; nous tachons de les rassembler sous des officiers et de les envoyer à quelques milles. Le canon qui reste, et une partie des munitions sera envoyé à Chattam, ou est un detachement de Jersay. Les autres munitions seront envoyées aïlleurs. Il y a eu du mouvement dans le detachement de Jersay qui est en avant de nous causé par quelques soldats anglois et irlandois, mais les autres les ont fait taire. On dit qu'une Brigade de Connecticut marche ici; en attendant nous avons derriere nous Princetown à notre droite environ deux cent Pensilvaniens eparpillés, devant nous trois cent miliciens, et trois cent hommes Continentaux de Jersay; ce qui joint à l'ennemi lequel cependant n'est pas encore sorti rend notre position un peu precaire.

Il y a deux choses qui m'allarment; la premiere que la milice n'est pas très disposée à ataquer ces gens-là dans le cas ou ils ne tenteront pas de passer à l'ennemi; la seconde que nous avons ici un de leurs chefs envoyés par eux pour chercher des munitions et le reste des hommes, que le g'al St. Clair a cru devoir faire arrêter, et que nous ne pouvons ni garder ni lâcher sans un danger eminent.

Le g'al St. Clair ecrit au g'al Waïne pour lui conseïller de venir trouver le g'al Washington; je ne sais s'il comprendra l'avis. Beaucoup de gens pensent que si la Pensilvanie peut mettre sa milice sur pied, il vaudroit mieux laisser le tout ou une partie passer la Delaware; la crainte qu'en ont les chefs me paroit de bon augure. J'attends ici le g'al Washington et cette Brigade de Connecticut. Si j'eusse été tout seul, là bas, peutêtre aurois-je pu rester, mais si je ne puis rien faire par persuasion j'aime mieux etre opposé aux ennemis qu'à mes anciens soldats, et je prefererai . . . [*rest of sentence obliterated by binding.*]

XXXI.

New Windsor ce 14 janvier 1781[13]

Le depart du C'l Armand,[14] Monsieur le chevalier, me fournit une occasion sur de vous ecrire, et j'en profite avec bien de l'empres-

[13] Fols. 200–201 v. A. L. S.

[14] Charles Armand, Marquis de la Rouerie.

sement; les nouvelles relatives aux Pennsylvaniens vous arriveront plutôt qu'à nous; cette affaire est la plus delicate et la plus desagreable qui nous soit encore arrivée; je ne sais ce qu'arrangera le president[15] qui s'est mis à la tête de cette negotiation, ou le Congres[16] qui s'en est mêlé sans que personne les en priat, mais je sais bien que la dissolution totale de la ligne me paroitroit moins facheuse que le pardon des principaux chefs, et que les officiers de Pennsylvanie sont trop militaires pour consentir à commander des troupes qui se seroïent impunement revoltés; j'aimerois donc mieux, Monsieur le chevalier, que cette division fut aneantie et rengagée par l'etat dont la mauvaise foi vis à vis une partie de leur soldats a causé tout ce fracas. Mais il faut laisser faire à ces Messieurs, et nous ne devons pas nous en mêler puisqu'ils se sont chargés de l'arrangement.

D'un autre côté, Monsieur le chevalier, le G'al Washington est fort embarrassé sur ce qu'il doit faire. L'importance de West Point lui a fait abandonner le projet d'aller sur le champ dans le Jersay. Nous avons preparé un detachement qui peut marcher au premier instant; mais sans compter que nos difficultés de provisions, de transportation etca., etca. sont pires qu'elles n'ont jamais été, sans parler du danger que courroit avec une foible garnison une place qu'il est impossible d'approvisioner, il y a bien des inconvenients à tirer l'épée contre ces mutins, et la certitude de les ecraser n'est pas assés grande pour encourager à une attaque. D'ailleurs, Monsieur le chevalier, j'avoüe qu'il est affreux de passer son hiver à s'entre tüer sans que l'ennemi essüie aucune perte, et quand je pense que la plus grande partie des soldats est entrainée par quelques chefs, que ces braves gens ont souffert avec nous pendant quatre ans, ont été blessés avec nous, ont partagé nos triomphes et nos malheurs, qu'ils ont à se plaindre non seulement de leur longue misere mais même d'une tromperie averée dans leurs engagements, je vous assure que la necessité de les combattre me paroitroit bien malheureuse.

Ceci fera bien du bruit à Rhode island,[17] et en fera bien davantage en Europe; mais si leurs troupes avoïent souffert pendant quatre ans ce qu'on[t] souffert les notres; si depuis quinze mois elles n'avoïent pas receu un sol de païe, si on ne leur avoit donné ni habits, ni vivres, si on les avoit déja retenu un an de plus que ne le portoïent leurs engagements, il est probable qu'ils n'attendroïent pas le treizieme mois pour dire qu'il est injuste de les retenir plus longtemps. Les grenadiers de France à Nancy, l'armée espagnole en Hollande, l'armée Anglaise en Amerique, les armées allemandes en differentes occasions, les armées de Cesar, celles d'Alexandre, celles du Connetable de Bourbon, tout cela s'est revolté pour des raisons bien moindres, et par consequent on ne doit pas etre si ettonné de ce que fait la ligne de Pennsylvanie presque toute composée d'étrangers.[18]

Depuis mon retour ici, Monsieur le chevalier, j'ai eu avec le g'al Washington de serieuses conversations, et le resultat n'est, je vous assure,

[15] *I. e.*, President Reed.

[16] Congress appointed a committee to investigate the revolt. It consisted of Sullivan, Witherspoon, Mathews, Atlee, and Bland. Its correspondence with President Reed is in *Penn. Arch., loc. cit.*; its report to Congress is in *Journals* (ed. Hunt.), January 24, 1781.

[17] *I. e.*, among the French officers and troops at Newport.

[18] *Cf.* Stillé, pp. 248–250, where it is stated that two-thirds of the Pennsylvania line were Scotch-Irish.

rien moins qu'agreable. Dans toute la confiance de l'amitié, et dans l'amertume de notre coeur nous sommes convenus que sans un prompt secours de vaisseaux et d'argeant nos affaires deviendroïent desesperées; il est impossible de se figurer nos embarras actuels; à peine peut-on fournir à la subsistence de la foible garnison de Westpoint; enfin, lors même que la France auroit eu l'odieuse politique dont les torys ont l'infamie de l'accuser, et que l'inaction des campagnes passées sembloit confirmer, il seroit tems de se decider à donner des secours efficaces et de s'assurer les avantages de cette Revolution. On croit à Versailles, monsieur le chevalier, que mon attachement pour l'Amerique me fait exagerer; il faut esperer que votre voix paroitra plus impartiale. Je vous prie de faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois, et d'agréer l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE

XXXII.

NEW WINDSOR ce 17 janvier 1781[19]

N'est-il pas ettonant, Monsieur le chevalier, que nous n'ayons pas encore receu des nouvelles de France, et que depuis le trois de juin il semble que l'on ait oublié cette partie-ci du monde? Il m'est arrivé par la poste un paquet de lettres particulieres et comme elles sont dattées du dix Avril elle ne renferment aucune intelligence qui nous puisse eclairer. Je ne sais ce que l'on fait en France; mais je suis humilié de voir les Anglois se promener impunement sur la côte, et Arnold[20] operer tranquillement avec ses quinze cent hommes. Quand aurons nous enfin cette superiorité maritime sans laquelle on ne fait rien, et que politiquement et militairement nous ne devions pas cesser un instant de conserver?

Le g'al Knox[21] a été se promener dans les etats de l'est, et mettre sous les yeux des assemblées la necessité de faire des efforts, et les inconvenients qu'il y auroit à se negliger. Voilà l'affaire de Pennsylvanie arrangée tant bien que mal; il est impossible de ne pas leur savoir gré du rôle qu'ils ont fait joüer à Sir Henry Clinton.[22]

Le general a receu de MMs. les generaux français des reponses relatives à l'affaire de la Floride. Mr. de Rochambeau dit qu'il faut avant tout attendre des nouvelles de France; Mr. Destouches dit qu'il n'a pas de biscuit et que par consequent il est impossible de sortir.[23] Tâchons donc que le corps de bataïlle se joigne vite à l'avant garde, et qu'il nous arrive un Amiral et des vaisseaux. Car quoi qu'on dise, Monsieur le chevalier, notre position est bien loin d'etre douce; c'est

[19] Fols. 202–203 v. A. L. S.

[20] Benedict Arnold, now in command of a small British force in Virginia.

[21] See instructions of Knox in Washington's letter to him of January 7, 1781, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 354.

[22] Referring to the complete failure of Clinton's efforts to induce the Pennsylvania line to come over to the British. Some of Clinton's emissaries were hanged.

[23] In a letter to Rochambeau and de Ternay of December 15, 1781 (Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 325), Washington had suggested the co-operation of the French in the Spanish expeditions against Pensacola and St. Augustine. The reply of Rochambeau, of January 10, is printed in Doniol, V. 401. It should be noted that de Ternay died on December 15, and that the Chevalier Destouches, senior captain, succeeded to the command of the fleet, holding it until the arrival of the Comte de Barras, on May 8.

avec une veritable affliction que je vois nos embarras s'accroitre; mandons le bien fortement à Versailles; sans argeant nous ne serons pas en etat de bouger, et, qui pis est, il n'y aura pas moyen de nous porter à manger ou nous resterons; chaque instant me demontre encore plus la necessité de nous secourir; Dieu veuïlle que les Ministres en soïent aussi persuadés que moi, et que surtout on ne perde pas de tems. Oserois-je vous prier, Monsieur le chevalier, de dire au Chev. du Buisson[24] que je ne puis lui rien mander encore de certain sur son affaire; le C'l Tilmangh par qui le general l'a fait passer est malade dans cet instant; la premiere occasion lui donnera quelque chose de plus sûr; le general se souvient cependant qu'une de ses lettres à Newyork n'a pas pu etre envoyée, parcequ'une des phrases en passant par les mains du general auroit fait prendre un engagement tacite à quelque chose dont il ne pouvoit pas repondre.

Aussitôt que vous aurés des nouvelles, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous conjure de me les faire parvenir d'une maniere plus expeditive que la poste ou les couriers ordinaires; je vous en promets autant de mon côté, et si vous avés quelque chose de plus pour le C'l Laurens je le ferai passer au port de Boston pour lequel il part demain matin.[25] Je lui ai donné plusieurs lettres d'introduction ou je repete les verités dejà dites tant de fois. Je n'ai pas encore ecrit ma lettre à Mr. de Vergennes, et j'espere que vous voudrés bien leur expliquer l'affaire de Pennsylvanie dont les details racomodent un peu le premier aspect.

Si nous parvenons à assurer pour quelques jours la subsistence de Westpoint, nous nous rendrons à Rhode Island et les nouvelles de france mettront peut-être le General à portée de prendre des arrangements ulterieurs.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, faites je vous prie mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois, et presentés mes hommages à toutes vos dames en agreant celui du tendre attachement que je vous ai voué.

LAFAYETTE

XXXIII.

RING WOOD ce 26 janvier 1781[26]

Cette lettre-ci, Monsieur le chevalier, vous sera remise par Mrs. de Charlus et de Dillon,[27] et n'ayant que le tems de vous ecrire un mot sur le coin d'une table, je m'en rapporte à eux pour vous donner des nouvelles; il n'y en a point encore d'Europe, et le Mars n'est pas plus arrivé que la Seconde division.

Les Pennsylvaniens sont tellement fondus qu'ils ne feront ni bien ni mal à personne; il est bien à desirer que l'etat refasse cette ligne, et qu'en remplissant le *Quota* ils ne mettent pas les amendes à quinze punds lorsqu'il en faut donner trente pour avoir un homme.

[24] The Chevalier du Buisson, a French volunteer officer in the American army, was made prisoner at the battle of Camden. His "affaire" refers to his exchange, with regard to which Washington wrote numerous letters.

[25] John Laurens was on his way to France. He sailed from Boston on February 13. See Benjamin Lincoln to Washington, February 15, 1781, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington,* III. 231.

[26] Fols. 204–205. A. L.

[27] Comte de Charlus de la Croix, son of the Marquis de Castries. Charlus was *mestre de camp en second* of the regiment of Saintonge and was a close personal friend of Lafayette. His father was at this time minister of the marine. Dillon is referred to by Washington, in his letter of January 4, as Count de Dillon, colonel in Lauzun's legion. Washington Papers, P. II., 267, in Lib. Cong.

Il n'y a que deux cent mutins du Jersay à Pompton; il y marche demain quatre cent hommes, et le general est determiné à user des voïes rigoureuses; le desir d'arrêter cet espoir de sedition l'a conduit à Ringwood. L'idée que les revoltés etoïent à Morristown, que par consequent les Anglois sortiroient, m'avoit mené ici pour etre opposé à ces derniers; dans les circonstances actuelles je n'ai rien à faire, et je retourne demain à New Windsor.

Ces Messieurs vous diront le petit succés qu'a eu le Lt. C'l Hale contre le Colonel de Lancey:[28] je suis bien aise qu'on ait donné sur les doigts à ce corps surtout dans la circonstance actuelle.

Mr. de Charlus vous parlera, Monsieur le chevalier d'une petite dispute entre le gouverneur Hancok et Mr. de Viomenil, ou je vois que Mr. de Valnais paroit avoir contribué; je ne donne à ces Messieurs aucune lettre pour Philadelphie; personne n'y peut presenter comme vous, et je prevois dejà que Mr. Dillon rendra ses devoirs à San francisco[29] de maniere à partager la bonne fortune de la Maison.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, j'espere que vous ne doutés pas de mon tendre attachement.

XXXIV.

New Windsor ce 2 fevrier 1781.[30]

L'arrivée de Mr. de Charlus, Monsieur le chevalier, et l'avantage qu'il a eu d'etre à peu près temoin oculaire, vous auront appris tous les details relatifs à l'affaire des troupes du Jersay;[31] elle s'est passée d'une maniere plus militaire que les negociations pennsylvaniennes; l'on doit aux bataïllons du Jersay la justice de dire que plusieurs d'eux, et entre autres une compagnie entiere d'infanterie legere avoïent refusé de quitter leurs officiers; il est je crois difficile de trouver plus de zele, plus de discipline, et plus d'oubli de son propre interest en faveur du bien public, que n'en a montré le detachement de la Nouvelle Angleterre. Le G'al Clinton vouloit encore se mêler de cette affaire-ci, et je ne sais comment il aura trouvé la plaisanterie de West Chester[32] pour ramener son attention au departement dont il etoit sorti.

Mes depëches vont partir pour Boston, Monsieur le chevalier, et je ne suis que trôp sûr d'y trouver encore le C'l Laurens. L'on chiffre actuellement ma lettre à Mr. de Vergennes,[33] et la premiere occasion vous en portera la copie qu'il seroit trop long de faire avant le depart de l'exprés. J'y delaïe dans un grand volume ce que j'avois mandé de Philadelphie: la necessité absolüe, *mais très absolüe* de nous envoyer de l'argeant pour mettre en mouvement l'armée Americaine; la necessité de faire ici une campagne decisive, et d'y avoir la superiorité maritime

[28] Expedition of General Parsons and Lieutenant-Colonel Hull against Delancey's corps at Westchester, January 21–22. British barracks were destroyed and some 54 prisoners taken. See Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 392, note.

[29] It has been impossible to explain this allusion.

[30] Fols. 218–219 v. A. L. S.

[31] The revolt of the New Jersey line of January 20 was speedily suppressed by the vigorous action of General Howe. See his letter to Washington of January 27, and other documents relating to the affair, in Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 560–566.

[32] See note 28.

[33] Lafayette to Vergennes, January 30–February 4, in Stevens's *Facsimiles*, no. 1632; printed in *Mémoires*, I. 394.

bien assurée, l'importance d'augmenter le corps de troupes, mais ne la regardant que comme le troisieme article, en ne croyant pas necessaire qu'il y ait ici plus de dix mille français, si le surplus nous privoit ou d'une partie de l'argeant ou d'une partie des vaisseaux dont nous avons besoin. Voilà, monsieur le chevalier, ce qu'il y a de plus interessant dans ma lettre; je mets sous les yeux du gouvernment l'humiliation que nous epprouvons en voyant les côtes ravageés par des detachements de quinze cent hommes; je rends la justice düe à nos soldats, et dis qu'on dois compter sur les troupes Americaines; je parle des Pennsylvaniens, des Jersaysiens, et vous sentés bien que je n'oublie pas les Nouveaux Angletteriens; quoique ma lettre ne soit pas une lettre d'admiration, j'admire cependant la sagesse du gouvernement en mettant le corps francais aux ordres absolus de notre generallissime; mais je ne dis pas que le ton de la derniere reponse de Mr. de Rochambeau ne m'a pas paru tout à fait aussi bien que les autres,[34] et je ne vous le dis même à vous qu'en confidence; enfin je termine ma lettre en promettant quinze mille hommes de troupes regleés, et dix mille hommes de milices, lors de l'expedition de Newyork, et en disant qu'avec les moyens proposés par mon epitre nous prendrons cette place la campagne prochaine.

Le general m'a communiqué quelques notes qu'il a données au C'l Laurens,[35] il voit nos affaires sous un point de vüe qui parle fortement pour la necessité du secours; tous les jours ajoutent à nos embarras; la maniere dont nous allons ne peut pas durer; on est fort serieux ici sur notre situation, et l'on regarde la prompte arrivée de l'argeant, des habits, etca, ainsi qui des vaisseaux comme une chose absolument necessaire: Repetés le bien, Monsieur le Chevalier, et comme on ne vous soupçonne pas d'autant de partialité, les verités que vous manderés feront plus d'effet que si elles venoïent de moi. Nous attendons le retour de l'exprés pour aller à Rhode island, et s'il vous reste des paquets à envoyer en France, je m'en chargerai d'autant plus volontiers que l'Alliance pourroit bien etre encore à Boston; quant à moi, j'ecris à tous les ministres collectivement, et individuellement.

Le general partira pour Rhode island aussitôt que notre exprès sera revenu; je ne doute pas que Mr. de Rochambeau ne fasse son possible pour le bien recevoir, et je suis bien sür du sentiment qu'il inspirera à l'armée française. Si par hazard il vous arrivoit des lettres, je vous supplie de me les envoyer par un courier particulier, et je vous en promets autant de mon coté. Quelque soit l'officier maritime qui nous viendra, vous ferés bien, je crois, de glisser un mot sur l'importance politique de se prêter à tout ce que le general Washington pourra desirer.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, agreés, je vous prie, l'assurance du tendre attachement que mon coeur vous a voué pour la vie.

LAFAYETTE

Voulés vous bien faire mes compliments à Mr. de Marbois; il est bien important que la Pennsylvanie s'evertue pour nous donner des hommes; cela ne va pas mal à ce qu'on dit dans la Nouvelle Anglettere, et si la Pennsylvanie fait quelque-chose nous aurons surement nos quinze mille Continentaux.

[34] Referring probably to Rochambeau's letter to Washington of January 10, printed in Doniol, V. 401.

[35] See Washington to Laurens, January 15, in Ford, *Writings*, IX. 102.

XXXV.

New Windsor ce 3 fevrier 1781[36]

Un Vaisseau de soixante et quatorze à la cote, Monsieur le chevalier, et un vaisseau de quatre vingt dix demâté, voilà comme un saint orage vous a accomodé la flotte de Gardner's Bay; celle de Rhode island se preparoit à en profiter, et la nouvelle vient de Mr. de Rochambeau;[37] je vous fais mon compliment, et n'ai que le tems de fermer ma lettre. Adieu

XXXVI.

New Windsor fevrier le 7 1781[38]

Vous aurés appris, Monsieur le chevalier, par le billet que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous ecrire, quelle a été la mauvaise fortune de cette pauvre escadre Anglaise, et le general a du envoyer au president du Congrés un extrait de lettre écrite par Mr. de Rochambeau; depuis cet avis, il ne nous en est point arrivé du general français, mais voici ce que dit le general Knox arrivant de Rhode islande, et qui a pris en chemin d'autres informations.

Il ne paroit pas douteux qu'un vaisseau de 74 n'ait peri sur une pointe de Long island; le London de 90 a été demâté, a, dit-on, jetté une partie de ses canons à la mer, et l'on ne savoit même ce qu'il etoit devenu; l'on ajoute qu'un vaisseau de 50 canons a beaucoup souffert et comme les Anglois avoïent sept gros Vaisseaux et deux petits, reste à six en etat de combattre, parmi lesquels on ne verra pas le Vaisseau à trois ponts.[39]

Lorsque le G'al Knox etoit à Rhode island on ne savoit encore qu'imparfaitement cette nouvelle. Le Capitaine Gardner[40] auquel on a la plus grande confiance, pensoit qu'il etoit dangereux d'attaquer les ennemis embossés à Gardner's Bay; mais aprés qu'ils auront retrouvé Le London, ils auront difficilement de quoi le remâter, et dans tous les cas, pour peu que l'escadre française ait cette activité à laquelle Mr. Destouche se prepare, nous devons au moins esperer la superiorité maritime.

En attendant que nos lettres fassent impression à Versailles, vous voyés que le ciel a daigné se rendre à nos raisons. Mr. de Rochambeau mande qu'au moins on pourra faire croiser deux Vaisseaux dans Le Sud; Mr. de Lafayette qui est plus jeune espere encore davantage, et le G'al Washington attend pour former un projet quelquonque non seulement que la nouvelle soit confirmée, mais que nous sachions à quel point Mr. Destouche en pourra profiter, et s'assurer cette divine superiorité navale. Le *toast* du quartier general est, puisse Mr. Destouche etre bientôt chef d'escadre!

36 Fol. 220. A. L.

37 Rochambeau to Washington, January 21, 1781, in Doniol, V. 405. See *infra*, note 39.

38 Fols. 221–223 v. A. L.

39 The damage caused to Arbuthnot's squadron by the storm of January 22 was less than Lafayette thought. The *Culloden*, 74, was wrecked but her masts and guns were used in repairing the other vessels. The *Bedford*, 74, was dismasted and had to throw her upper tier of guns overboard, but was repaired in time to take part in the action of March 16. The *America*, 64, was driven out to sea but returned undamaged. The *London*, a three-decker of 98 guns, was not damaged. Clowes, *Royal Navy*, III. 489; Sparks, *Writings*, VII. 403, note.

40 There were three or four Captain Gardners in the Continental army.

Le G'al Knox a été parfaitement receu de Mr. de Rochambeau ainsi que de toute l'armée française, et nous est revenu enchanté de leur politesse, de leur discipline, de leur beauté, et de leur excellence en tout genre;[41] le general Howe va partir pour New port, et je lui donnerai des lettres d'introduction; vous savés, Monsieur le chevalier, à quel point mon coeur joüit de tout ce qui ressere les liens de l'amitié, et de l'estime entre les deux Nations. Nous partirons, j'espere, le quatorze ou le quinze, passerons par Lebanon pour y voir la legion de Lauzun, et j'arangerai à arriver par Providence afin de donner beau jeu aux arrangements de Mr. de Rochambeau. Je donnerai à ce general des avis exacts de notre marche, et je crois que l'armée française ne sera pas mecontente du generallissime. Si Mr. Destouche pouvoit regner sur la côte, ou si nous recevions des nouvelles de France, ce seroit un bontems pour ajuster les grands et petits projets que nous pourrions avoir.

Après ne vous avoir parlé que de nos embarras, Monsieur le chevalier, et de la triste necessité ou nous sommes reduits, je prends plaisir à vous dire ce que nous apprenons de favorable. L'esprit de patriotisme, de haine pour les Anglois, et la determination de soutenir fortement la guerre, brillent dans la Nouvelle Angletterre avec toute la ferveur du premier moment; tous les bataïllons seront presque complets, point de deserteurs, l'on peut dire point d'etrangers, chaque fermier s'empresse d'engager son fils au moins pour trois ans, et en tient un autre tout prêt pour l'expiration de ce terme; il en coute cent trente dollars pour un homme, mais la classe qui ne fournit pas païe une amande double de ce qu'a couté l'homme le plus cher; les etats ont aussi donné une gratification aux soldats actuellement au service; tout le monde sera content, et nous aurons une armée Bien Belle, Bien Bonne, Bien Nationale. L'etat de New York se conduit toujours bien; celui de Jersay n'a besoin que d'un petit nombre de recrües, et j'espere que vous stimulerés votre Pennsylvanie. Un emprunt d'argeant, Monsieur le chevalier, des habits, une superiorité maritime et dix mille français, voilà ce qu'il nous faudra pour faire une campagne glorieuse, et raffler la puissance anglaise. Pour un homme qui haït la Nation Anglaise, Monsieur le chevalier, et qui aime la Nation Americaine, il est impossible de ne pas remarquer une gradation frappante. Tous les Pennsylvaniens composés d'anglois et d'irlandois se soulevent generalement; les Jersiens ou la proportion est moindre forment une revolte partielle, et toute une compagnie legere refuse d'abandonner son Capitaine; les Nouveaux Angletteriens, tous Nationaux, marchent à travers la neige pour soumettre les mutins, et nous avons appris depuis que malgré nos precautions des sergeants revoltés s'étoïent glissés la nuit à Ringwood parmi les troupes du detachement, mais en avoïent été honteusement chassés par les soldats. Un detachement du C'l Slamnocle[42] revenoit dernierement du Jersay et passoit par Pompton, mais les soldats se souvenant de la revolte, ont passé au milieu des troupes du Jersay sans vouloir leur parler ni leur repondre.

La poste est si incertaine, Monsieur le chevalier, que j'attendrai le depart d'un officier pour vous envoyer ma depêche Ministerielle, je vous fait de tout mon coeur mon compliment sur la bonne conduite du Maryland et de la Virginie. Quoique très empressé de voir remedier à nos souffrances et envoyer des secours sans lesquels avec toute la volonté du

[41] *Cf.* Knox to Washington, February 7, 1781, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington,* III. 222.

[42] Scammell? (Alexander Scammell, colonel of the First New Hampshire.

monde nous ne pourrons pas aller, je n'en vois pas moins avec plaisir le *Spirit* qui semble se renouveller, et les efforts que fait l'Amerique pour la cause commune; j'en conclus, Monsieur le chevalier, que les etats unis seront tous independants, et que les Anglais ne prendront pas ces pauvres rebelles parmi lesquels il en est un surtout qui vous a voué une amitié eternelle.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois; nous prendrons des informations plus exactes sur ce qui concerne les Hessois, et j'aurais l'honneur de vous en instruire; toutes mes chaines d'espions sont en desordre; les uns ont besoin de detachements pour aller chercher leurs nouvelles, les autres n'osent pas quitter leurs maisons pour venir à New Windsor, et mes oracles sont devenus muets comme ceux des païens; mais quand les diables reprendront la campagne, j'espere avoir de meïlleures nouvelles. Dans tous les cas il est difficile aux ennemis de deserter à moins que nous ayons des postes près des leurs; harlem Creek, et les refugiés sont une facheuse barriere.

Si j'avois laissé chés vous ou chés Mr. de Marbois une carte du Jersay et Newyork à la main collée sur du papier et dechirée, je vous prie de me l'envoyer cachetée par une voie sur. Personne ne la possede et nous mettrons une grande valeur à en avoir l'exclusion.

XXXVII.

New Windsor ce 7 fevrier 1781[43]

La deconfiture Anglaise va si vîte, Monsieur le chevalier, que j'ai à peine le tems de faire l'oraison funebre d'un vaisseau, avant que je n'apprene le malheur d'un de ses camarades; vous savés le London egaré sans mâts et sans canons, le Culloden à la côte, et l'Ademant demâté; une lettre de New London nous parle d'un quatrieme vaisseau de ligne, 74 à ce que je crois, lequel ne faisoit que mettre le néz dehors au moment du coup de vent, et s'est trouvé sorti juste ce qu'il en falloit pour perdre ses mâts, sa premiere batterie, et se retirer clopin clopant dans la Baïe de gardner, si nous avons nouvelle d'un cinquieme, Monsieur le chevalier, je m'empresserai de vous en faire part, et dieu veuille que chaque heure de ma vie soit employée à raconter le desastre d'un vaisseau de plus, jusqu'à ce que toute la Marine Anglaise y passe, et que j'aie chanté la perte du dernier petit batteau portant le pavillon de St. George.

Lf.

XXXVIII.

New Windsor ce 13 fevrier 1781[44]

Les details que nous avons eus, Monsieur le chevalier, sur l'etat et la position de l'escadre Anglaise ne sont pas encore aussi certains que je le desirerois; il est cependant sur qu'un vaisseau de 74 a peri, et qu'un ou deux ont été demâtés. Mais je crains que le London ne soit pas de ce nombre, et je ne sais si les mâts du Colloden ne pourront pas encore servir à quelque autre bâtiment. Mr. Destouches a fait passer à Newlondon un officier auxiliaire, et l'a chargé d'aller reconnoitre l'ennemi. Quelques espions ont été sur Long Island et nous aurons bientôt (quoique ce soit un peu tard) des nouvelles circonstanciées.

43 Fol. 226. A. L. S.

44 Fols. 227–228. A. L. S.

Si l'escadre francaise est egale, je voudrois bien qu'elle mit les ennemis à portée de combattre; si elle est superieure et ne peut rien faire contre Gardner's Bay, il seroit à desirer qu'elle allat toute entiere dans la Baïe de Chesepeake. Si elle pouvoit y demeurer assés longtemps superieure, nous ferions l'effort de fournir un detachement Americain.

Les succes du sud sont glorieux autant qu'utiles; mais le G'al Greene m'ecrit une lettre confidentielle[45] par laquelle je vois que sa situation est des plus facheuses. Malgré les derniers avantages il croit avoir beaucoup à craindre, et parmi l'immensité de ses besoins, le premier article est de la Cavalerie. Il seroit bien avantageux qu'on put arracher à Mr. de Rochambeau la legion de Lauzun. Ce dernier est ici, et desire vivement aller en Caroline.

S'il vient des nouvelles, monsieur le chevalier, je ne doute pas de votre bonté à les envoyer à Newport par un courier. Nous partons le 16, dinerons le 19 avec Lauzun, serons le 22 à Newport, et le general en repartira le 26 ou 27 pour New Windsor. Pour moi, je resterai quelques jours avec mes amis de Rhode island et de Boston.[46]

La derniere affaire de Morgan ne laissera pas que de confirmer en France notre opinion sur les soldats Americains et je ne puis vous exprimer le plaisir que cette affaire m'a fait. Il eut été charmant que la legion de Lauzun en eut été, mais on entendra pas nos *Hints,* et le general est avec raison fort eloigné de presser un pareil article.

Adieu, monsieur le chevalier, agrées l'hommage de mon tendre attachement.

LAFAYETTE

Je vous envoye copie de ma lettre à Mr. de Vergennes,[47] et vous prie de faire partir l'expedition chiffrée par quelque occasion dans votre canton; vous y trouverés un petit bout de lettre relatif à la derniere affaire. Mes compliments, je vous prie, à Mms. de Marbois, Charlus, et Dillon.

XXXIX.

NEW WINDSOR ce 15 fevrier 1781[48]

Le duc de Lauzun part ce matin, Monsieur le chevalier, et Mr. de Ste. Même[49] nous est arrivé hier au soir; je suis bien empressé de vous faire passer les nouvelles qu'il donne, et le tresorier de notre armée qui naturellement doit voyager très lestement, se charge de vous porter ma lettre à Philadelphie.

Un batiment des isles arrivé à Newlondon dit que notre Gouverneur de St. Vincent ayant vendu l'isle à l'amiral Rodney, les anglois etoient venu l'attaquer avec grande confiance; mais Mr. de Bouillé informé du complot avoit eu le tems de faire mettre le gouverneur aux fers, et d'en

[45] *Cf.* Greene to Washington, January 24, 1781, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington,* III. 214. "Les succes du sud" refer to Tarleton's defeat by Morgan at the Cowpens, on January 17.

[46] The intended visit to Newport was not made. On February 20 Washington gave Lafayette command of a detachment sent south to attack, and if possible capture, Arnold. See instructions of Washington to Lafayette, February 20, 1781, in Sparks, *Writings,* VII. 417.

[47] See *supra,* note 33.

[48] Fols. 229–229 v., 233 (the letter is bound incorrectly). A. L. S.

[49] Comte de Sainte-Mesme (Saint-Maime, Sainte-Même), later Maréchal du Muy. He was at this time colonel of the regiment of Soissonnais.

nommer un autre qui a receu la descente à coups de canon, et aprés avoir tué deux cent hommes aux Anglois, les a forcé de se rembarquer. Le Commandant infame qui, j'espere, appartient à la Brigade irlandoise, mais qu'une personne connoissant les isles croit etre un creole qui la campagne avant derniere avoit un petit corps, a été transferé dans une fregate à la Grenade et puis à la Martinique.[50]

Le même batiment dit aussi que Rodney avoit eu le projet d'attaquer la Grenade mais qu'avec son activité ordinaire Mr. de Bouïllé s'etoit porté sur cette isle et y avoit conduit un renfort de quatre cent hommes.

Je joins ici, Monsieur le chevalier, la copie d'une lettre de Mr. de St. Simon[51] à Mr. de Ste. Même; cette lettre ressemble beaucoup à celle qu'il a ecrite à Mr. de Rochambeau et qui nous a été envoyée par le general. Vous verrés que l'expedition de Pensacola est au fond du golfe du Mexique et l'armée de don Navia, reduite à six mille hommes, ne se met pas encore en mouvement.[52] Vous verrés que notre seconde division arrive par la Martinique, mais qu'elle n'y etoit pas encore; il y aura trop de troupes et de vaisseaux aux isles pour que l'amiral Rodney puisse s'occuper beaucoup de son confrere Arbuthnot.

Nous avons enfin, Monsieur le chevalier, un etat sur et exact des forces anglaises à Gardner's Bay. Tout ce qui leur reste sur les côtes y a été reuni, selon toute apparence, et d'après le compte officiel envoyé par les generaux français et dont je vous fais passer copie,[53] les anglais ont cinq vaisseaux de ligne et un de cinquante, ce qui fait au plus six contre sept, et en supposant que le vaisseau perdu se retrouvat, il ne feroit qu'augmenter l'embarras du Bedfort et la necessité de perdre beaucoup de tems pour les trainer à Newyork. Je ne sais encore sur quelle echelle les generaux français jugeront à propos de maneuvrer, mais il me semble que toute notre escadre peut se promener ou elle veut.

Excusés, Monsieur le chevalier, l'etourderie qui me fait envoyer cette lettre en deux volumes, et agrées l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

Lf.

Je n'ecris pas à Mr. de Marbois, ni beaucoup à Mr. de Charlus par cette occasion-ci, mais je vous prie de leur faire mes compliments et de leur dire mes nouvelles.

XL.

New Windsor ce 19 fevrier 1781[54]

Recevés mes remerciements, Monsieur le chevalier, des nouvelles que vous avés la bonté de me mander; l'arrivée du Vicomte de Rochambeau[55] mettra les Ministres à même de preparer un plan de campagne; dieu veuille qu'il nous procure plus d'activité, et determine une bonne fois

50 Rodney made an attempt on Saint Vincent on December 15, 1780. See Clowes, *Royal Navy*, III. 479. The Marquis de Bouillé was governor of the Windward Islands.

51 The Marquis de St. Simon, stationed at Santo Domingo.

52 Referring to the expedition against Pensacola under Bernardo de Galvez which had been scattered by a storm and forced to reorganize at Havana. Pensacola was finally captured on May 9, 1781.

53 Rochambeau to Washington, February 3, 1781, in Doniol, V. 410.

54 Fols. 231–232 v., 224–225 v. (incorrectly bound). A. L. S.

55 The Vicomte de Rochambeau was the son of the Comte de Rochambeau. He had been sent to France after the Hartford conference to represent to the ministry the need for further aid and to endeavor to hasten the departure of the second division. It is his arrival in Paris that is here referred to.

la fin de cette guerre; tout changement en Allemagne m'effraïe. J'aime pour le present qu'on y soit d'humeur pacifique, et l'imperatrice reine usoit toujours de son influence pour que tout restat tranquille. Vous juguerés mieux que moi de l'effet que sa mort peut produire.[56] Les dix mille hommes projettés pour Mr. de Rochambeau ne deplairont pas à ce General; il peut en jouïr d'avance comme nos Catholiques alliés anticipent la prise de Gibraltar; j'espere que Mr. de Rochambeau aura du moins un grand Morceau de l'armée demandée; mais Gibraltar ne s'entrainera pas si facilement.

Cette lettre-ci, Monsieur le chevalier, vous sera remise par notre Quartier Maitre General,[57] et je puis en toute sureté vous faire confidence des projets du General Washington qui doivent etre particulierement secrets pour reussir.

Par une lettre de Mr. de Rochambeau[58] nous avons appris que la totalité des forces ennemies se monte à sept vaisseaux dont un hors d'etat de servir, ce qui les reduit à six vaisseaux dont un de cinquante canons contre les sept vaisseaux bien frais et reposés de Mr. Destouches. Le general français mande qu'en consequence de cette superiorité l'on enverra soit quelques bâtiments soit la totalité de l'escadre dans la Baie de chesepeake, et que la destruction d'Arnold paroit être un objet très important.

Le General Washington a repondu[59] que l'importance d'une tentative contre Arnold etoit d'autant plus grande qu'elle auroit beaucoup d'influence sur les operations de la campagne prochaine; l'escadre française n'etant jamais plus sûre de la superiorité qu'en se tenant ensemble, il à presumé que Mr. Destouches se determineroit à sortir avec tous ses vaisseaux. Mais comme la nouvelle position d'Arnold le met à portée de remonter ses bâtiments sous la protection de ses canons, le succès de Mr. Destouches dependant ou d'une surprise, ou du hasard qui feroit sortir Arnold, il n'y auroit qu'un moyen de le rendre certain, celui d'une cooperation terrestre.

Le general fait part à Mr. de Rochambeau qu'il enverra d'ici un detachement de douze cent hommes à Head of elk, et si l'escadre croit à propos d'operer, ce dont il ne peut pas etre juge, ne connoissant rien aux affaires Maritimes, il regardoit comme necessaire d'envoier quelque artillerie de Rhode island.

Il paroitroit même important à nos succès que Mr. de Rochambeau put envoyer un detachement de mille hommes avec l'escadre; mais le general dit qu'il ne peut porter aucun jugement sur cet article, attendu qu'il ne connoit pas les defenses de Rhode island, et le nombre d'hommes necessaires à la parfaite sureté de ce poste.

Le general mande aussi que pour arrêter son projet il attend les reponses de Rhode island, mais que l'inconvenient de faire inutilement marcher un detachement pour quelques jours n'etant pas à comparer à l'avantage de sauver du tems en cas d'expedition, les troupes se mettront en marche le vingt pour Morristown.

Par cette lettre, Monsieur le chevalier, le General abandonne entierement à ces Messieurs la poursuite, ou la condamnation du projet.

[56] Referring to the death of the Empress Maria Theresa, on November 29, 1780.

[57] Colonel Timothy Pickering?

[58] Rochambeau to Washington, February 3, 1781, in Doniol, V. 410.

[59] Washington to Rochambeau, February 15, 1781, in Ford, *Writings*, IX. 139.

L'ignorance d'affaires Maritimes donne à Mr. Destouches toutes les facilités de refuser son escadre; *l'ignorance de la situation des defenses à Rhode island* et toutes les autres expressions de cette lettre laisse toute liberté à Mr. de Rochambeau et lui menage tous les moyens de refuser honnêtement; cela n'est pas si sûr, mais je l'aime bien mieux; il n'est pas si interessant de prendre Arnold et quinze cent Hommes que de conserver l'air du zele de leur part, et d'entretenir la plus parfaite harmonie.

Mais depuis cette premiere lettre le General a receu des avis de Virginie et de Philadelphie. Depuis le coup de vent Arnold se fortifie à Portsmouth; si l'on ne le detruit pas toutes les forces de Virginie seront conservées dans ce quartier là, et le general Greene resistera difficilement à une armée deux tiers plus nombreuse que lui. Nous sommes donc plus persuadés que jamais de l'importance de l'expedition; mais d'après les calculs faits, et l'assurance de trouver du gros canon à Philadelphie, le general pense que nos forces Continentales jointes à la Milice suffiront seules pour l'objet terrestre; d'aprés cela, Monsieur le chevalier, le General vient de recrire à Mr. de Rochambeau[60] que s'il trouvoit le moindre inconvenient à envoyer des troupes et de l'artillerie, nous regarderions comme suffisant d'avoir la protection navale; que si profitant de sa superiorité, Mr. Destouches nous donnoit la sureté de traverser la Baie en partant d'Head of Elk ou nous embarquerons et si nous n'avions pas à craindre un renfort de troupes de New York, le General leur devroit le succès d'une expedition très importante.

Il est possible que la premiere lettre souffre des difficultés, mais celle-ci me paroit bien simple, et tant que Mr. Destouches aura au moins sept contre six, il seroit facheux qu'il refusat de sortir pour assurer notre operation. La lettre du general lui laisse toute facilité mais j'espere qu'il se determinera à tenir la mer.

Le detachement partira demain; il est composé de trois bataillons de 400 hommes sous les Colonels Vauce [*sic*], Gimat et Barber,[61] Mr. de Gouvion[62] fait les fonctions d'ingenieurs, et le C'l Stevens[63] part pour preparer le detachement d'artillerie. C'est moi qui commande ce corps, et qui prendrai en Virginie le commandement general des troupes Americaines.

Si Mr. Destouches ne refuse pas de nous proteger à notre passage dans la Baie, et s'il promet au general de profiter de l'etat de la flotte anglaise, j'espere vous embrasser à Philadelphie le 1er. ou le 2 de Mars et prendre vos ordres pour le general Arnold.

Notre destination est un profond secret, et tout le monde croit aller à Staten island ou Bergen Neck; je vous prie de vouloir bien avoir l'air de tout ignorer à cet egard, et de faire seulement part de ma confidence à Mr. de Marbois lors de son retour.

C'est une drôle de chose que de nous voir voyager; nous n'avons pas un sol, pas un cheval, pas une charette, pas un brin de foin. Je suis precedé d'une troupe d'executeurs accompagnés de soldats montés sur les chevaux du premier venu pour en aller prendre d'autres. Nous vivrons d'industrie et marcherons au depends du voisin jusqu'a Head of

60 Postscript dated February 19, of letter cited in note 59.

61 Colonel Joseph Vose of Massachusetts, Lieutenant-Colonel Gimat, a French volunteer, and Lieutenant-Colonel Francis Barber of New Jersey.

62 Jean Baptiste Gouvion, engaged as engineer officer by Franklin and brevetted colonel by Congress.

63 Ebenezer Stevens, lieutenant-colonel 2d Continental artillery.

elk. On dit que [quand] la reponse de Rhode island arrivera nous enverrons saisir des batiments, de façon que nous irons et viendrons par mer et par terre aux depends du prochain et dans tous nos arrangements, il n'a pas seulement été question d'avoir un shilling.

Il faut que le general soit bien convaincu de l'importance de l'expedition pour se saigner autant ici. Je joins une lettre pour Mr. de Charlus, en cas qu'il ne soit pas parti, et je serois charmé qu'il fut revenu à Philadelphie lors de mon passage. Mais je ne voudrois pas qu'il y eut rien d'affecté parceque je suis toujours sur de le trouver en chemin, et que le moindre indice donneroit des soupçons. Je joins aussi un quadruplicata de ma dépêche; vous en avés deja receu un exemplaire, et deux autres partent par l'Alliance et le Rambler de Boston.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, excusés mon griffonage, je suis pressé d'envoyer ma lettre, et ne prendrai que le tems de vous embrasser.

LF.

Je vous ecrirai dans peu de jours

XLI.

ELK ce 7 Mars 1781[64]

Je ne pouvois pas quitter plutôt Philadelphie, Monsieur le chevalier, et encore, y a-t-il quelques articles qui trainent; mais cependant j'ai bien fait d'arriver ici, et rien n'etoit preparé pour l'embarquement; nous avons à present trente batteaux, on dit que les autres arrivent, et quoique les vents, le tems, et les chemins semblent arrangés exprés contre nous, j'espere que nous pourrons etre enfin embarqués demain au soir. La sotte chose, Monsieur le chevalier, que de faire des expeditions à crédit et de passer son tems à prendre par force le bien du prochain, ou à lui demander la charité. Si vous nous faites prêter de l'argeant, nos affaires iront d'elles mêmes, et il n'y aura que du plaisir à conduire les operations.

Celle-ci cependant, Monsieur le chevalier, n'est pas encore retardée par nous, et si vous en exceptés quelques bruits vagues, je n'ai rien entendu dire du Romulus et les fregattes ses compagnes.[65] Le Baron de Stubens[66] m'ecrit du 1er. Mars et m'attend avec trois à quatre mille hommes; Gouvion a epprouvé toutes les malencontres possibles, et s'est enfin debarqué le quatre à une assés grande distance d'Hampton. En supposant qu'il arrive le six, je puis avoir de ses nouvelles demain au soir et si nous avions aussi la fregatte, ma petite flotte mettroit à la voile apres demain; jusqu'ici c'est moi qui suis l'amiral, notre plus grand vaisseau est de 12 ou 16 canons et n'est pas encore arrivé.

Je vous envoye, monsieur le chevalier, un quadruplicata que je vous prie de faire partir par quelque occasion; faites, je vous prie, mes compliments à Mr. de Marbois et agrées l'assurance de mon tendre et sincere attachement.

LF.

[64] Fols. 234–234 v. A. L. S.

[65] The British vessel *Romulus* was captured by a squadron of one vessel and three frigates under de Tilly, which under orders from Destouches made an excursion to the Chesapeake in February.

[66] Major-General von Steuben had been left in command in Virginia by Greene.

XLII.

Elk ce 8 Mars 1781[67]

L'amitié de Mr. de Rochambeau pour moi, monsieur le chevalier, en a plus fait que n'en a jamais pu faire sa confiance; il a su que je devois commander l'expedition, et dès ce moment les dangers se sont evanoüis; plus de necessité pour garder les vaisseaux, plus de besoin des troupes pour defendre Rhode island, toute l'escadre marche, les grenadiers, les chasseurs, des detachements, enfin un corps de 1100 hommes, et pour y mettre plus de grace vis a vis de moi, l'on me donne l'honneur de cooperer avec le plus ancien officier general, le Baron de Viomenil.

Tout cela est superbe, Monsieur le chevalier, et les mechantes gens avoient bien tort de dire que Mr. de Rochambeau fait à ma jeunesse l'honneur de la jalouser; le seul petit inconvenient est que les generaux français trouvent de l'impossibilité à nous envoyer une fregatte ici; le general Washington m'a mandé[68] qu'il croioit interessant à la sureté de l'expedition, et à l'honneur des armes Americaines que nous arrivions là bas, et dans l'esperance d'etre à Rhode island avant le depart de l'escadre, il a monté sur le champ à cheval pour se rendre à cette place.

Je ris de l'arrangement dans ce qu'il a de personnel à moi, et suis bien aise que nous aions enfin trouvé un moyen d'ebranler Mr. de Rochambeau, d'autant mieux qu'il a decidé cet envoy depuis qu'on lui a dit n'en avoir pas autant de besoin qu'on croioit d'abord. Mais j'espere qu'il ne refusera pas de nous envoyer chercher, attendu que s'il reussissoit les americains auroient une jalousie bien fondée d'avoir été laissés là après une marche si fatiguante et à deux journées du point d'operations; s'il etoit repoussé, il y auroit des disputes très desagreables.

Pour prevenir tout cela, je vais entasser mon monde et les conduire à la garde de dieu jusqu'a Annapolis, et je risquerai ma personne dans un petit bateau pour aller causer avec Mr. de Viomenil; je crains que les deux Barons[69] s'entendent mal, *I feel* pour les francais, les Americains, et moi-même. La lettrè du general est pressante et son depart prouve qu'il entend le projet de Mr. de Rochambeau.

Ceci doit etre secret exceptés pour Mr. de Marbois, et vous en sentés la consequence pour moi.

Charlus trouve que ceci ressemble beaucoup à Closter Camp.[70]

XLIII.

Williams Burg ce 23 Mars 1781[71]

Vous serés affligé, Monsieur le chevalier, de la tournure qu'ont pris nos affaires; c'est au moment ou nous esperions le plus une heureuse cooperation que l'arrivée de l'escadre anglaise est venu detruire tous nos projets.[72]

67 Fols. 235–236. A. L.

68 Washington to Lafayette, March 1, 1781, in Ford, *Writings*, IX. 177.

69 Vioménil and Steuben.

70 Battle of Clostercamp or Klostercamp, October 15–16, 1760, in which de Castries (father of Charlus) defeated a force of Hanoverians.

71 Fols. 237–238. A. L.

72 The French fleet left Newport for the Chesapeake on March 8; the English squadron under Arbuthnot sailed from Gardiner's Bay on the 10th, caught up with the French and engaged them off Cape Charles on the 16th. The British squadron, gaining the advantage in this action, was able to secure control of Chesapeake Bay and the French returned to Newport. Clowes, *Royal Navy*, III. 489–492.

A Annapolis nous avions douze cent hommes Continentaux, ici cinq mille hommes de Milices et il en arrive tous les jours, provisions, bœufs, chevaux, artillerie, tout etoit ramassé en quantité mais avec de grande depenses; j'apprends le vingt qu'une flotte paroit; comment ne pas ecrire que c'est l'escadre partie le 8 de Rhode island; les ennemis eux mêmes y ont été trompés; et sans pouvoir deviner ce que sont devenus les français, nous ne savons rien si non que les anglais sont dans la Baie avec douze vaisseaux ou fregattes et que notre operation est selon toute apparence manquée.

Le general Greene qui mandoit dernierement au Baron de Steuben que son sort dependoit de notre succès ici a risqué une action avec Cornwallis dans laquelle l'espoir d'etre debarassé d'Arnold avoit surement part. Il a été defait, car il a perdu le champ de bataïlle et du canon, mais s'est retiré en bon ordre à dix milles et continuoit à faire excellente contenance.[73]

Je resterai ici deux ou trois jours, mais le detachement a ordre de se tenir prêt à quitter Annapolis. Sa composition rend absolument necessaire qu'il se reunisse à la grande Armée. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur.

Mille Compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois.

XLIV.

Osburn's ce 9 avril 1781[74]

Ma situation, monsieur le chevalier, ne laisse pas que d'etre un peu gênante; quand je regarde à gauche voilà le general Phillips avec son armée et le commandement absolu de james River; en tournant à droite l'armée de lord Cornwallis s'avance à toutes jambes pour m'avaler, et le pis de l'affaire est qu'en regardant derriere moi je ne vois que 900 hommes de troupes Continentales, et quelques miliciens tantôt plus tantôt moins mais jamais assés pour n'etre pas completement rossé par la plus petite des deux armées qui me font l'honneur de leur visite. Le general Phillips etoit la nuit derniere à Brandon au sud de james River à trente cinq milles d'ici et me fait encore craindre pour Richmond; lord Cornwallis a fait l'autre jour son entrée dans Hallifax 80 milles d'ici et au train que va sa seigneurie je m'attends à lui voir à tous moments faire son entrée dans mon Camp; le general Greene est devant Camden. Il a eu avec lord Rawden une action longtems disputée, mais n'ayant que des rapports vagues je vois seulement que les retranchements de Camden ne seront pas sitôt emportés, et comme le general Waïne est encore bien loin, je n'ai secours à espérer que — — de mes jambes dont je compte faire un usage convenable. Pour achever la plaisanterie on me mande de partout que le general Clinton vient se mettre de la fête; me voilà donc proscrit par ce triumvirat mais n'etant pas aussi eloquent que Ciceron ce n'est pas la langue que ces messieurs me couperont.

Me voici dans l'ancien camp des ennemis, possesseur du quartier et du lit du general Phillips mais trop poli pour ne pas le lui rendre aussitôt qu'il en aura besoin; quelques milices sont sur le côte nord de james River, et j'ai tant bien que mal etabli ma communication sur la protection de Richmond; je vais aussi etablir une communication [à] appamatox

[73] The battle of Guilford Court House, March 15.

[74] Fols. 239–240 v. A. L.

ou le general Phillips a brûlé le pont de Peters Burg mais elle sera tant bien que mal; nous n'avons point de batteaux et ce n'est pas le premier sujet de plainte dans un païs ou il n'y a point d'armes. Le peu de milices que nous aurions est inutile faute de fusils, et c'est avec grand peine que nous pouvons avoir des cartouches.

Cette armée-ci auroit besoin de six semaines de repos pour arranger les departements, mais nous sommes tellement sur le qui vive qu'il m'est difficile de faire le metier de quartier maître, Commissaire, intendant etca, etca, etca. Si le general Phillips compte marcher son sejour est une faute et comme nous n'avons pas d'heures à perdre j'ai profité du tems qu'il nous donne pour embarasser sa marche et assurer un peu mieux nos mouvements; mais tout cela se reduira au triste honneur d'etre battu et aneanti quelques jours plus tard. Ce pauvre Richmond que nous avons sauvé pourrait bien epprouver la vengeance de Phillips; quoique ma situation ne soit pas merveilleuse, je ne puis m'empêcher de sourire à la ridicule figure que nous ferons contre ces deux messieurs reunis, et de la mine qu'auront nos dragons de milice sans pistolet, sans epée, sans selle, sans bride, et sans botte, contre les Simcoes et les Tarletons.[75] Votre amitié, monsieur le chevalier, desiroit de me voir general de ce qu'en Amerique on appelle une armée; faites moi donc votre compliment, car je ne suis gueres dependant du corps etabli à 300 miles de moi et dont nous ne pouvons même pas avoir une lettre; je dois même avoir double de plaisir car j'ai un generalat à deux faces et la consolation de penser que quand une des deux armées seroit aneanti l'autre suffiroit pour me battre à platte couture; ce qui m'impatiente le plus est le denüement de toutes choses, le manque total de ressources, la lenteur d'execution qu'on est forcé de rencontrer dans cette partie-ci du Continent; d'un autre coté l'on ne sentira pas tant le desavantage que nous donne l'inferiorité navale, et quand je suis obligé de consulter les circonstances politiques, de tâter le poux [*sic*] du peuple, on me jugera comme si j'agissois en allemagne.

Pendant ce tems la fregatte que je *montois* est à Philadelphie et Madame Craig que Mr. de la Touche[76] *Courtise* finira par ammener pavillon; je n'ecris ni à Mr. de Marbois, ni à Mr. de la Touche ni à mes amis de l'armée française; je n'ecris pas non plus à versailles etant fort occupé ici. Faites leur mes compliments et agrées l'assurance de mon attachement.

Pour l'amour de dieu envoyés nous les Hussards de Lauzun.

XLV.

ELK ce 10 Avril[77]

Je viens de tant griffoner, Monsieur le chevalier, que je ne vous ecrira ce matin que quatre lignes; Mr. de Charlus vous aura dit tout ce qui a rapport à notre expedition; il y a du malheur, mais point de faute, quelques personnes voudroient que les français eussent poursuivi, ou bien qu'ils fussent partis plutôt; mais tout le monde rend justice à leurs intentions à leur conduite pendant le combat, et la Virginie et Maryland sont sur cela aussi justes que la Pennsylvanie.

[75] Lieutenant-Colonels T. Graves Simcoe and Banastre Tarleton were the cavalry commanders in Cornwallis's army.

[76] De la Touche-Tréville, commanding the *Hermione*.

[77] Fols. 241–242. A. L.

Les ennemis semblent faire exprés de redoubler leurs depredations pour faire sentir leur presence dans la Baïe. Toutes les lettres que je reçois parlent d'incendies et de cruautés. Le gouverneur de Maryland me mande que les bâtiments ennemis remontent le pottowmack et doivent brûler Alexandria. Il craint pour Baltimore et Annapolis; je marcherai bien demain de ce coté là, mais la defense de ces rivieres est à peu prés aussi aisée que celle des rivieres qui sont dans la lune. Vous savés surement que je pars pour le sud; nos officiers et soldats n'en sont pas trop contents; nous n'avons ni argent, ni habits, ni souliers, ni chemise et dans quelques jours nous en serons à l'ordinaire des pêches vertes; nous avons les pieds dechirés faute de souliers et les mains galeuses faute de linge; quand je dis nous c'est dans toute la force du terme, car je crois mon baggage pris. Mais tout cela ne nous empechera pas de marcher s'il le faut, et demain nous nous mettrons en marche pour executer les ordres du general qui croit ce parti necessaire.

Adieu, monsieur le chevalier, mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois, je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur.

Il est dommage que je m'en retourne, car nous aurions vaincu l'escadre anglaise avec deux canons de dix huit mis sur un bateau, ce qui m'auroit fait une reputation Navale.

On pretend que le president du Congres, a receu la nouvelle qu'il venoit un detachement anglois à New Castle. Si cela etoit ainsi il vaudroit autant qu'ils nous envoyassent cette nuit ordre de rester ici, mais j'ai bien de la peine à le croire à moins que le G'al Clinton ne soit devenu fou, ce qui pourroit bien etre car il y a quelque tems qu'il s'amusoit à chasser des Harengs morts avec une meute de chiens courans.

XLVI.

SUSQUEHANA FERRY ce 14 avril 1781[78]

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, me voilà parti et la Susquehana etoit pour moi le Rubicon; je vais courir après le general Philips, mais n'espere pas l'attraper, et soit que je commande en Virginie ou que je forme ma jonction avec le G'al Greene, je ne suis pas prés d'avoir le plaisir de vous embrasser. Ce qui m'en fâche est que ceci ne ressemble gueres à la prise de ————[79] mais le general me mande qu'il n'oze pas confier à des lettres ce qu'il auroit à me dire sur nos operations.

Si la superiorité maritime arrive on peut faire une belle operation à Portsmouth, et si nous avions aumoins la flotte avec une addition de troupes Continentales nous embarasserions beaucoup les Ennemis; il faudroit que Mr. de Treville annonçat à son arrivée un grand zele, et proposat de proteger des troupes Americaines et des troupes françaises partout où l'on voudroit; je souhaitte pour le bien de la chose, et pour mon agrement particulier que les operations mineures se tournent vers la Virginie.

Vous pouvés compter, Monsieur le chevalier, d'avoir en ma personne un correspondant exact; je compte assés sur vos bontés pour esperer que vous voudrés bien aussi me faire passer les nouvelles et surtout celles de France; adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, agrées l'assurance du tendre attachement que mon coeur vous a voué pour la vie.

[78] Fols. 243–243 v. A. L.

[79] New York.

XLVII.

Susquehana ce 14 avril 1781[80]

Vous etres bien aimable, Monsieur le chevalier, de prendre autant de part à la triste situation de mes soldats et à mon eloignement de la grande armée; il deserte tant de monde que nous serons bientôt reduits à une poignée d'hommes, et tous nos efforts ne pourront pas l'empêcher; ce plan n'est aucunement venu de la personne dont vous avés parlé à Mr. de Gimat, et il n'est pas même à present dans la famille; mais si vous voulés que je vous parle en ami, j'aurois donné mon avis Contre dans le Conseil de guerre.

Les esperances du G'al Washington ne parroissent pas entre nous si brillantes que les votres; je crains qu'il n'y ait quelque erreur de compte dans le nombre de nos hommes; sans cela la prise de ————[81] est sûre. Peut être n'aurois-je pas été inutile sur la Riviere du Nord, et jusqu'ici je n'avois pas pu obtenir la permission de m'ecarter, mais on a jugé notre voyage necessaire et je tâcherai d'y servir de mon mieux. Adieu, monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur.

XLVIII.

Alexandria ce 22 Avril 1781[82]

Par le retour du C'l Gouvion, Monsieur le chevalier, vous aurés appris tout ce qui a precedé notre depart de Susquehana ferry.

Votre amitié pour moi m'assure que vous serés bien aise de recevoir de nos nouvelles; les dernieres n'etoient pas brillantes et la situation des officiers et soldats jointe à la nombreuse desertion des premiers me rendoient le voyage du sud encore moins agreable. Mais partout ou l'on est employé, il faut faire le mieux possible, et ma gazette vaudra cette-fois-ci un peu mieux que la derniere.

En passant la Susquehana je mis à l'ordre un petit sermon et en me servant de l'amitié qu'on veut bien avoir pour moi jettai une aspersion de deshonneur sur le vice de desertion;[83] depuis ce tems deux hommes seulement deserterent et encore furent ils rattrappés; j'en ai fait pendre un et l'autre a été renvoyé au Nord avec un soldat qui avoit fait une forte sottise. À present les têtes des soldats sont tellement montées, que les hommes renvoyés m'ont fait supplier par les officiers de les laisser venir au sud, mais j'ai été inflexible, et un sergeant malade qu'on vouloit laisser derriere en pleuroit de douleur au point qu'il a fallu lui permettre de se trainer à notre suite. Huit des anciens deserteurs sont revenus, et disent que les remords de leur conscience ne leur ont pas permis de s'eloigner de nous, de maniere qu'a present un soldat seroit fort choqué qu'on lui proposat de joindre la grande Armée

Depuis une lettre du Baron[84] dattée le 10 avril à Chesterfield Court House je n'ai rien eu d'officiel sur les mouvements de Philips; le Baron me mande qu'il est arrivé avec quinze cent à deux mille hommes et que cette force jointe à celle d'Arnold reste encore à Portsmouth; les arri-

[80] Fol. 244. A. L.

[81] New York.

[82] Fols. 245-246 v. A. L.

[83] See the substance of these orders in *Mémoires*, I. 267–268.

[84] *Cf.* Steuben to Washington, April 15, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 290.

vans de Richmond et Petersburg disent qu'on y evacue les magazins publics et que l'armée de Philips est attendue dans cette partie.

Le danger de la Virginie et les forces de Philips m'ont déterminé à entreprendre une marche forcée pour arriver à Frederisburg et delà selon toute apparence à Richmond. Mes baggages, tentes et artillerie viennent derriere sous l'escorte d'un detachement, et 300 hommes par bataillon donnant, officiers et sergeants compris, environ 100 combattants s'avancent avec moi en toute diligence; par ce moien nous pourrons couvrir quelques parties de la Virginie, nous tromperons les calculs du G'al Philips, et comme (quoique me dise à l'oreille l'amour de la popularité) je m'empare à main armée de tous les chevaux et chariots qui nous peuvent en partie transporter d'une ville à l'autre, nos soldats s'amusent beaucoup de cette maniere de voyager. Je suis venu en deux jours de notre camp prés Baltimore en passant par le ferry de Georgetown, et deux journées nous transporteront à Frederisburg.

Il faut que je vous fasse part, monsieur le chevalier, d'un arrangement qu'il m'a été necessaire de faire pour remplir les instructions du General et transporter le detachement; le Board of War m'a mandé qu'il ne pouvoit rien donner, et d'un autre coté le manque de linge et de souliers est tel que sans un secours les soldats ne peuvent pas avancer; ils ne se plaignent jamais, mais comme le manque de chemise donne la Galle, et le manque de souliers surtout dans une marche forcée finit par dechirer le pied, je ne puis pas abuser de leur zele au point de les mettre tous à l'Hopital. Les marchands de Baltimore nous prêtent environ deux mille loüis avec lesquels j'aurais les articles les plus necessaires; c'est moi qui reponds pour le public de cette somme païable avec interests dans deux ans, tems ou je puis vendre mon bien; mais avant ce tems-là je proposerai à nos bons alliés *d'ajouter* cette somme à l'emprunt fait par les etats unis; mille loüis envoyés en marchandises en feront l'affaire et par la vente monteront à la somme due avec l'interest; de façon que le Congrés ne sera endetté que pour mille louis; le pis qui en puis arriver est qu'on s'en prenne à moi, et en attendant nous aurons un pantalon, une chemise par homme, quelques chapeaux, quelques souliers, et je viens de faire le même marché pour une centaine de paire de souliers à Alexandria; mais les secours du Board of War n'en sont pas moins necessaires.

Le General m'ecrit le 14;[85] il me repete qu'il y a des choses qu'il voudroit me dire mais n'ose pas confier au papier; Hamilton arrivoit d'Albany et mande qu'il va quitter la famille. Tous deux disent que d'aprés les conversations avec Mr. de ————[86] l'entreprise sur ————[87] est improbable et dans tous les cas seroit immensement eloignée; que diable aura-t-il donc pu leur dire? Je voudrois bien que vous m'expliquiés cette enigme.

Si l'on coopere contre ————[88] il paroit que ma personne sera rapellée mais non pas mon detachement. Rester en Virginie me plairoit plus que la Caroline; je voudrois avoir été un quart d'heure au Quartier General; je compte sur vous, monsieur le chevalier, pour me faire passer toutes les nouvelles; ecrivés moi je vous conjure, des lettres longues et confidentielles; je vous en promets autant. Le general ne me dit rien de

[85] Washington to Lafayette, April 14, 1781, in Sparks, *Writings*, VIII. 13.
[86] Rochambeau.
[87] New York.
[88] New York.

l'approche de l'armée francaise; je me suis fort amusé à Baltimore, et toutes les dames travaillent à me faire des chemises; de facon que je n'ai pas perdu mon tems au Bal.

Mes compliments, je vous prie, à Mr de Marbois; priés le de donner de mes nouvelles à Mr. de Charlus auquel je n'ai pas le tems d'ecrire. Voilà une lettre que l'on m'a remis pour vous arrivée par un bâtiment de Cadix qui doit aller à Frederisburg. S'il y a des nouvelles je vous prie de me les faire passer. Les torys marchands de farine sur la Baïe de chesapeake .'. . [*rest of sentence obliterated by binding.*]

XLIX.

RICHMOND ce 22 May 1781[89]

Nous sommes encore en vie, Monsieur le chevalier, et notre petit corps n'a pas jusqu'à ce moment receu la terrible visite; lord Cornwallis est à Petersburg, et a tranquillement passé à travers la Caroline du Nord; il paiera bien un droit de peage pour traverser la Virginie, mais nous ne pouvons pas esperer de faire grande resistence, la proportion en infanterie reguliere est entre quatre et cinq contre un, en cavalerie dix contre un; il y a quelques torys dont je ne m'embarasse gueres; notre Milice n'est pas bien nombreuse sur le papier, l'est bien moins encore *in the field*. Nous manquons d'armes, nous n'avons pas cent Riflemen, et si nous sommes battus, c'est à dire si l'on nous attrappe tout se dispersera. La Milice s'emploie avec avantage dans le nord, mais dans ce païs-ci il y a tant de routes qu'a tout moment on prète le flanc ou l'on est tourné; il faut maneuvrer, il faut s'eclairer, et tout cela, (sans Cavalerie surtout) nous est bien difficile.

L'armée de Philips etoit composée de 2300; il a receu un renfort de Portsmouth, et lord Cornwallis ayant laissé à Wilmington les malades et blessés a joint cette garnison à l'armée qui a combattu le general Greene; voici un ordre de Marche: Tarleton's legion, Hamilton's Corps, 23d, 71st 33d Regiments Anglois, 200 tories, un Regiment Hessois, la Brigade des gardes et infanterie legere, le tout accompagné de six pieces de canon. Tarleton a 300 hommes montés et la Cavalerie de Simcoe augmente tous les jours. On nous mande du bas de la Riviere qu'un nombre de bâtiments de transport escortés par deux fregates sont arrivés dans Hampton Road et remontent à present James River; en verité ces messieurs abusent de la permission; je voudrois bien savoir, Monsieur le chevalier, si l'on s'attend à me voir *Bien Rosser le fou de Cornwallis*.

Pour l'amour de dieu, mandés moi ce que sont devenus les pennsylvaniens; ils devoient passer le pottowmack avant moi, et si nous avions resté autant qu'eux en chemin les anglois seroient en possession de toute la Virginie; leur jonction avec nous rendroit notre petite Armée un peu plus respectable; nous serions battus mais au moins nous le serions deçement.

Le Baron de Steüben est à soixante milles d'ici et marchera pour le sud avec 400 recrües; il est tellement *Unpopular* en Virginie que je ne suis pas faché de son depart; mes deux generaux sont Mullenberg et Nelson; j'ai deux autres Brigadiers employés à rassembler des Milices; le G'al Morgan me joindra dans une quinzaine de jours.

La legion de Lauzun, Monsieur le chevalier, nous seroit d'une im-

[89] Fols. 247–248 v. A. L.

mense utilité; Lauzun desire servir dans le sud, et servir avec moi; si nous avions au moins ses Hussards notre Cavalerie pourroit se montrer, et la Cavalerie fait tout en Virginie; employés votre influence pour nous les faire avoir, et si les Pennsylvaniens n'etoient pas encore partis conseilles leur de se mettre en marche; Seconde division, qu'etes vous devenüe? tout le monde me demande tant des nouvelles de la flotte que j'en suis embarrassé; si jamais elle entre dans Hampton Road il faut sur le champ envoyer une fregatte avec pavillon Anglois pour detruire les bâtiments ennemis dans james River; cette fregatte devroit etre accompagnée de deux petits cutters et me donner sur le champ des nouvelles.

Si je peux trouver une occasion de me battre sans etre aneanti c'est à dire de me battre en detaïl, je ferai un petit paragraphe pour Mr. Dunlop[90] et en attendant je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Monsieur de Marbois.

L.

Camp près Pamunkey 16 Juin 1781[91]

Il y a bien longtems, monsieur le chevalier, que je n'ai eu l'honneur de vous ecrire, il y a bien longtems que je n'ai ecrit au Congrès; cela n'en est pas mieux fait, mais pour le premier article il falloit une occasion, pour le second il falloit une époque; ni l'une ni l'autre ne se sont rencontrées; mais comme il faut faire une fin, je vais ecrire, et demain il partira un exprès pour Philadelphie.

Permettés moi, monsieur le chevalier, de vous renvoyer à ma lettre publique;[92] j'y dis la verité, mais je ne dis pas tout parceque je suis bon homme; la conduite d'une certaine personne a grand besoin d'*Enquiry*; mais je ne me soucie pas de tout ce tripotage et j'abandonne Ce particulier à l'opinion publique.[93]

Jusqu'à present, Monsieur le chevalier, Mylord n'a pas reussi à engager une affaire; nous avons pendant longtems eu Tarleton dans notre camp deux Heures aprés qu'il etoit quitté; il n'y a pas eu un coup de fusil de tiré et la jonction s'est faite avec les pennsylvaniens; j'attendais qu'elle se feroit plutôt, j'attendois qu'ils seroient plus nombreux, j'attendois que 500 hommes de troupes reglées et un corps de milice attaqués par quatre cent hommes dont deux cent armés de sabre defendroient le passage d'une Riviere impassable;[94] je suis persuadé qu'il a fait pour le mieux, mais en toutes choses j'ai été comme nous disons *dé sappointé*.

Aprés nous etre assés heureusement reglissés entre l'armée ennemie et nos magazins nous avons fait une jonction avec quelques Riflemen; lord Cornwallis a paru ne pas aimer ces terreins montagneux et s'est retiré du coté de Richmond; nous nous donnons les airs de le poursuivre et mes Riflemen barboüillés de charbon font retentir les bois de leur hurlements; j'en ai fait une armée de diables, et leur ai donné absolution

[90] John Dunlap, publisher of the *Pennsylvania Packet*.

[91] Fols. 249–252. A. L.

[92] The "lettre publique" is doubtless a letter to Congress. It does not appear to be among the Continental Congress Papers.

[93] Lafayette refers here to Steuben's retreat before Simcoe, and the loss of military stores. See extract of letter from Lafayette to Washington, June 18. in Tower, II. 333.

[94] See note 93.

pleniere. Ce que j'ai en troupes regulieres est fort bon mais peu nombreux; le Baron avoit pris une position fort avantageuse de l'autre coté de Staunton River environ quatre vingts milles du point d'ou il est parti; graces aux remontrances d'un de mes aides de Camp, et de la declaration qu'a fait la milice qu'elle le planteroit là, il se rapproche de james River; cela fera une jonction tardive, et encore serons nous fort inferieurs aux ennemis.

Je donne mes pleins pouvoirs pour la paix, monsieur le chevalier, mais à condition que les *treize* etats seront independants; quand au reste, je ne serai pas difficile; quelques bagatelles aux isles et aux indes, quelques arrangements relatifs au departement de la Marine suffiront pour me satisfaire; mais sans l'independance des treize, il n'y a pas de lien qui tienne, nous ne serions pas d'accord. Il me paroit que les ennemis veulent faire croire que les etats du sud leur appartiennent; lord Cornwallis dans une de ses lettres jette cette idée en avant comme une chose assés bien etablie. Ma conduite vis a vis de lui est calculée sur les mêmes motifs politiques; quand il change de place je tâche que mes mouvements y donnent l'air d'une retraite; dieu veuille qu'il y eut moyen de lui donner l'air d'une defaite. Le Congrés fera bien d'imprimer des extraits de mes lettres; j'y serai exact observateur de la verité; mais cette verité prouvera j'espere que l'etat de Virginie n'est pas conquis, et que l'armée Americaine n'est pas aneantie; jusqu'à present nous l'avons echappé, mais si nous ne sommes qu'un peu battus, je serai encore fort content; du moins en perdant du monde, nous tâcherons que les ennemis ne s'en retirent pas sans quelque perte.

Le general me mande, monsieur le chevalier, que Newyork sera vraisemblablement l'objet de la campagne prochaine;[95] il paroit desirer que je ne remette pas le commandement de l'armée en d'autres mains qu'en celles du general Greene, mais si nous nous rejoignons, je dois alors etre de la Cooperation avec l'armée française; il est si rare, (je dirois même avec quelques uns de mes amis si ridicule) de commander à mon age quelque chose honoré du nom d'armée, que je resterai dans le sud aussi longtemps que je serai opposé en chef à lord Cornwallis; je le dois à la confiance dont le general veut bien me flatter, mais si l'on me debarasse du terrible fardeau que m'impose le manque absolu de moyens et la superiorité des ennemis je partirai pour la grande Expedition. Dieu veuille qu'elle reussisse; un pareil evenement fairoit bien à la paix. Si j'avois les moyens que je n'ai pas pour battre sa seigneurie cela ne feroit pas mal non plus pour la negotiation.

Je m'etois toujours douté qu'à force de dire donnés moi vingt milles hommes on ne nous donneroit rien du tout; graces à dieu, nous aurons un peu d'argeant, un peu, je dis, mais il sera bien employé.

Le coeur me bat, monsieur le chevalier, quand je pense à ce traité de paix; d'un coté, je vois l'amerique independante, je vois l'ambassadeur d'anglettere faisant des compliments à monsieur l'ambassadeur des etats unis; je vois tous les anglois se mordre les levres quand par inadvertance on prononce le nom d'amerique et de guerre Americaine; je vois les francois et les Americains se tenant sous le bras en païs etranger et passant à coté d'une societé d'anglois; enfin il y a mille petites jouissances que je me promets independantes du grand But de la Revolution;

[95] The intercepted letter of Washington to Lafayette of May 31 corresponds to the letter here referred to. It is printed in Stevens, *Clinton-Cornwallis Controversy*, I. 505.

mais de l'autre, je sens que je consentirois à un silence eternel plutôt que de dire la colonie Angloise de Georgie ou de Caroline; j'epprouve même en l'ecrivant le sentiment d'un homme qui blasphême pour la premiere fois.

Vous etes bien bon et bien aimable de vous occuper de notre petite Armée, je suis bien touché de l'interest que vous prenés à elle et à l'homme qui la commande; de bonne foi, je n'ai ni assés d'experience ni assés de talents pour combattre tant de difficultés; encore si nous etions egaux, je pourrois laisser agir la fortune.

Ma premiere ligne composée des pennsylvaniens et infanterie legere est commandée par le general Waïne; la seconde composée de milices est conduite par le nouveau Gouverneur Nelson, le meilleur que l'etat de Virginie put choisir; les Riflemen et troupes legeres sont sous le G'al Mullemberg; le G'al Weedon est à Frederiksburg pour rassembler en cas d'alarme les milices voisines du pottowmack. J'attends le Baron et les generaux Lawson et Stevens,[96] mais le Baron est si *unpopular* que je ne sais ou le mettre; violà, monsieur le chevalier, le tableau de notre petit corps; lord Cornwallis a des Brigades des gardes, des brigades d'infanterie legere, des Regiments Anglois, des Regiments allemands, je ne sais combien de dragons, enfin tous les grands airs d'une Armée; ils ont fait beaucoup de Wighs sur le chemin, mais presque tout le monde a pris parole. Ceux qui refuseront de prendre les armes seront envoyés aux ennemis.

Nous avons des Commissaires qui me font donner au diable, mais je le leur rends bien; le quartier maitre de l'etat ma signifié depuis longtemps que je ne devois en rien compter sur lui; chaque departement en fait autant, et nous vivons, mangeons, et remuons par artifice; tous ces embarras joints à l'activité de la campagne ne me laissent gueres le tems d'ecrire en France; je vous prie quand vous aurés des occasions de m'en faire part, et lorsque vous croirés n'avoir pas le tems de recevoir mes lettres je vous conjure de donner de mes nouvelles à Mr. de Vergennes qui voudra bien en instruire mes amis; quant au journal de nos operations en Virginie il n'est pas interessant à deux mille lieues, et pourvû qu'ils sachent qu'il y a une forte armée Angloise et une petite Armée Americaine en campagne voilà tout ce qu'il leur en faut.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse d'aussi bon coeur que je vous aime.

LI.

WILLIAMSBURG ce 9 Juillet[97]

Permettés moi, monsieur le chevalier, de vous renvoyer encore à ma lettre publique;[98] elle contient la gazette de nos operations; je souhaitte qu'elles soient approuvées à Philadelphie; si lord Cornwallis connoissoit mieux mes forces, il ne me croiroit pas si pressé de lui donner bataille; enfin le voilà de l'autre coté de l'eau. Je rassemble les moyens de le suivre; s'il passe la barriere de Virginie, ma tâche est remplie, et aprés avoir renforcé le G'al Greene j'irai vous embrasser à Philadelphie; adieu, monsieur le chevalier, vous connoissés mon tendre attachement.

[96] George Weedon, Robert Lawson, and Edward Stevens were brigadier-generals of Virginia militia.

[97] Fol. 253. A. L.

[98] Letters of Lafayette to Congress of July 8 and 9 are in the Cont. Cong. Papers (Lib. Cong.), no. 156, fols. 171, 174.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois; quand vous ecrirés en France mandés leur que je ne suis pas mort, mais que quand on a 23 ans, une armée à commander et lord Cornwallis devant soi, le tems qui reste n'est pas trop long pour dormir. Les ennemis ont receu un renfort à Charlestown et Greene se retire à ce que l'on dit, mais je n'ai rien encore receu de lui.

LII.

Montock Hill 14 aoust 1781[99]

Lord Cornwallis est à York et à Glocester, Monsieur le chevalier, à cheval sur York River, et nous nous sommes mis à cheval aussi à la pointe qui forme la fourche, de cette même Riviere; delà nous pouvons voir arriver des vaisseaux; dieu veuille que nous voyons des vaisseaux à pavillon blanc; les ennemis se fortifient un peu, mais n'ont pas l'air aussi empressé qu'on pourroit croire; peut-etre y a-t-il du grabuge dans le Menage, et alors s'ils n'etoient pas encore decidés, ce seroit bien en vain que nous rompons la tête pour les deviner; si le general Clinton ne veut pas ordonner qu'on detache, il devroit au moins venir prendre ici le commandement; j'aimerois mieux etre debarrassé de lord Cornwallis que du tiers de son Armée; il me comble de politesses, et nous faisons la guerre en *gentlemen*; c'est même les seul gentleman qui ait commandé les anglois en Amerique; mais au bout de tout cela il finira par me donner les etrivieres; la deffense de cet etat ressemble au tonneau des danaïdes; le poste d'York met lord Cornwallis en etat de rassembler ses forces et le rendra formidable, la fortune se lassera de nous proteger, et quand je serai tout seul, je serai battu.

Mon dieu, pourquoi n'avons nous pas ici une escadre! Pourquoi n'avons nous pas la legion de Lauzun? J'aimerais mieux 300 Houzards que quinze cent hommes d'infanterie; je pourrois offrir à Lauzun un commandement agreable, et je crois qu'il seroit fort aise de venir; mais je n'espere pas qu'on l'envoie à moins de certain evenement,[100] alors le plutôt seroit le mieux.

Si l'armée francaise pouvoit tomber des nües en Virginie et etre soutenüe par une escadre nous ferions de bien bonnes choses; si une escadre arrivoit il faudroit qu'elle entrat tout de suite dans la baïe; je suis à trente mille par eau et trente cinq par terre d'York et Glocester et nous pouvons nous porter de l'un ou l'autre coté; mais je n'ose esperer aucun secours etranger, il me paroit encore probable qu'on enverra des troupes à Newyork; mais je n'ai point de certitude sur cet article; les mouvements par eau sont difficiles à connoitre depuis que les ennemis sont à York. Portsmouth est beaucoup plus commode.

Oserai-je vous prier, Monsieur le chevalier, de faire mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois et faire passer cette lettre à votre Amie; je l'aime, puis-je dire sans fard, de tout mon coeur; adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, j'espere que vous connoissés mon tendre attachement.

Me voici pour longtems en Virginie; lord Cornwallis est si attachant! Mr. Jefferson refuse, mais si on lui permet de passer plus tard je crois qu'il acceptera; c'est un Homme d'esprit, un habitant du sud, et un Eminent lawyer, trois qualités qui sont en sa faveur.

[99] Fols. 254–255. A. L.

[100] The capture of New York.

LIII.

Camp entre les Branches d'York River[101]
21 aoust 1781

Vous savés tout comme moi ce qu'on attend, Monsieur le chevalier, je me borne à vous dire ou en sont les choses en Virginie

Lord Cornwallis est à York et a un corps de troupes à Gloster; il fortifie cette derniere pointe; il n'a pas encore fortifié York; notre petite armée fait semblant de marcher à gauche, et se portera lestement à droite pour se rapprocher de james River; Portsmouth n'est pas evacué; nous regarderons de tous nos yeux

Adieu, monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur.

Lf.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois.

LIV.

Holt's forge ce 1er Septembre[102]

Recevés mon Compliment, Monsieur le chevalier, et jamais je n'en fis de meilleur coeur; 28 vaisseaux de ligne et 3200 Hommes de troupes auxquelles Mr. de Grasse offre pour un coup de main d'en joindre 1800, voilà l'agreable visite que nous avons dans la Baye; j'avois ces jours-ci maneuvré pour empêcher les ennemis de passer james River et se retirer en Caroline; à present nous allons nous occuper de la jonction; Mr. de St. Simon a la bonté de dire qu'il sera sous moi; mais d'aprés le concert qui regnera entre nous, il sera difficile de savoir quel est l'ancien; demain et aprés demain nous assemblerons un corps en avant de James town ou les transports français remonteront sous la protection de 3 fregattes; le 4 et le 5 on debarquera; le 6 nous serons reunis et prendrons, j'imagine, un poste d'observation; Mr. de Grasse voudroit operer sur le champ; je ne sais pas l'avis de Mr. de St. Simon; le mien seroit d'attendre la reunion de nos forces et j'espere parvenir à en prouver la necessité; il ne faut pas que trop d'empressement gâte un jeu sûr. Mr d'Annemours prendra les arrangements de subsistence et nous tâcherons de pourvoir aux besoins du moment.

Lord Cornwallis n'a qu'un moyen de se sauver; mais il faut remonter jusques prés du point of fork,[102a] et cette possibilité lui est encore enlevée si, comme je l'ai proposé, on force sur le champ la passe d'York. La terre et la mer temoignent un zele charmant, et j'espere que tout ira pour le mieux

Mr. de Portaïl, Mr. de Gimat, et Mr. de Camus[103] ont été á la flotte; Gimat remonte la riviere avec les troupes; j'espere apres demain faire une visite à Mr. de St. Simon; les espagnols se sont conduits comme de petits anges; d'ici á quinze jours nous aurons dans la Baie 18000 Hommes et 38 vaisseaux qui ne laisseront pas que de faire un bon effet; notre petite armée est dans la joie, et vous m'avoüerés que je serois degouté si je n'etois pas content; adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur.

Mes compliments, et mon compliment à Mr. de Marbois.

[101] Fol. 256. A. L. S.

[102] Fols. 257–258. A. L.

[102a] Point of Fork, where Virginia had recently established an arsenal, was at the junction of the Rivanna and the James, in Fluvanna County.

[103] Duportail was chief of engineers in the Continental service, There was a de Camus, ensign of the *Éveillé*.

LV.

Willamsburg 8 7bre 1781.[104]

Je vous demande pardon, Monsieur le chevalier, de ne point vous ecrire moi même, mais a force de faire le quartier maitre, le commissaire, de voler du sel, de presser des boeufs, et de crier pour de la farine, j'ai fini fort maladroitement par me donner la fievre et la migraine, qui se passera dès le moment que je me permettrai quelques heures de someil. Je ne sçai pas si je deperis de viellesse car depuis deux jours mes vingt quatre ans sont bien sonnées.

L'armée française est debarquée, dans un clin d'œil. Grace aux soins de la marine nos trouppes ont repassé la riviere, je ne crois pas que jamais mouvement maritime se soit fait plus lestement que celui des français.

Ce n'est pas sans peine que nous avons pû mettre en marche les trouppes; les officiers americains ont donnés leurs cheveaux et leurs chariots, avec cela nous avons rassemblé nos forces dans une bonne position a Willamsburg. Votre amitié pour nous Monsieur le Chevalier, sera bien aisé d'apprendre les bontés dont on me comble icy. Mr. le Marquis de St. Simon a bien voulu insister pour etre sans restriction aucune, aux ordres du General Americain; d'aprés la maniere pleine de bontés dont tous ces messieurs me traitent, je me trouve avoir un commandement que je n'aurais jamais esperé, 3200 hommes composé des dédoublements d'Auvergne, de Bear[n][105] et du Regiment de Touraine et de cent hussards que je vais monter, 2500 americains reguliers en comptant le bataillon de Maryland qui n'est qu'a un jour de marche, et de la milice qui arrive tous les jours dont une partie est dans le County de Glocester. Voila Monsieur le Chevalier ce que nous avons ici. James River bien gardée par les batimens armés, ceux qui etoient dans Yorck River au dessous de la ville sont dessendus aujourd'huy, peut etre en consequence des nouvelles que vous avés fait passer à M. de Grasse. Cet amiral nous auroit donné 1800 hommes de troupes si nous avions pu attaquer tout de suitte. Mais Monr. de St. Simon et moi nous pensons egalement que le morceau seroit trop dur; Cornwallis se fortifie avec son activité ordinaire.

Si vous avés quelques occasions pour France, Monsieur le Chevalier, oserai-je vous prier d'y mander que je suis en vie. Dans deux ou trois jours je vous depecherai un gros paquet de lettres pour l'Europe. Adieu Monsieur le Chevalier mes compliments à Mr. de Marbois et agrées l'assurance de mon tendre et sincere attachement.

Lafayette

LVI.

Camp devant York ce 30 septembre 1781[106]

Enfin, Monsieur le chevalier, nous voici devant la ville d'York, et nos operations vont bientôt devenir bruiantes; une lettre de Mr. de Grasse nous avoit fait craindre sa sortie de la Baïe; je fus deputé pour en representer les inconvenients; l'armée navale ne sortira pas, et je revins le 28 au moment ou nos troupes s'avancoient de Williamsburg ici; le 29 a été employé à reconnoitre et entourer la place; ce Matin les ennemis avoient evacué leurs ouvrages avancés; ceux de la droite ont été occupés par les

[104] Fols. 259–260. L. S.

[105] It is not clear what is meant here. The writing is not legible.

[106] Fols. 261–263. A. L.

français qui ont eu un officier tué et quelques hommes blessés; ceux de la gauche ont été occupés par nous; le colonel Scamel[107] a été blessé et pris en reconnoissant de trop près. Voilà tout ce qu'il nous en a couté dans la journée, et l'ennemi se tient dans ses fortifications interieures; il est vrai que ce qu'ils ont evacué ne valoit rien, et ne pouvoit pas même se defendre d'un coup de main; mais aussi nous les approchons plus que nous ne pouvions l'esperer, et nous voyons que l'expedition n'offrira pas de bien grandes difficultés; ceci doit naturellement raccourcir notre journal de quelques jours.

Mr. de Grasse reprendra son ancien mouillage a Linn Haven Bay; tout bien comparé les Marins ont decidé que c'etoit la meilleure position qu'ils pussent prendre; ils nous promettent de bien fermer la porte ou de faire un mauvais parti à ce qui entrera; j'ai été enchanté de la franchise et de la bonne volonté de notre Amiral; il desire emmener le plus de vaisseaux possible, et a de grands projets pour la suite de la campagne; si ceci finit vite, je voudrois bien qu'il put nous prêter encore quelques jours d'assistance pour quelque operation dans le sud soit grande soit petite.

Il paroit que nous n'aurons point de vaisseaux au dessus d'York dont bien me fâche; mais nous en aurons trois au dessous avec deux fregattes; les ennemis envoyerent l'autre jour cinq Brûlots sans aucun effet; le G'al Weedon avec 1500 Milciens, Lauzun avec sa legion, et Mr. de Choisy[108] avec 600 Hommes qu'il a été chercher à la flotte, sont pour le present les seules troupes du coté de Glocester; il est vraisemblable qu'on en fera passer quelques unes d'ici.

Par une lettre du G'al Jones de la Caroline du Nord j'apprends que le G'al Greene a eu une affaire tres vive avec le C'l Stuart;[109] le Commencement ne nous reussit pas bien mais la fin nous fut trés avantageuse et comme le C'l Lee avec quelques autres troupes etoient detachées, comme le lendemain après la jonction on entendit recommencer une affaire, nous esperons que ces bruits assés bien fondés seront suivis par la nouvelle d'un avantage très decisif; on parle même de couper le corps Anglais; mais sans trop nous livrer à l'espoir je ne doute pas que le G'al Greene n'ait eu quelque grand succés contre ce Stuart que lord Lawdon[110] m'a dit luimeme avoir laissé en Caroline pour commander les troupes hors de la ville; en revenant de la flotte je m'arrêtai à bord de la Diligente, et le hazard me procura l'honneur de souper avec sa seigneurie.

Quand les paquets de Mr. de Grasse pour l'Engageante vous arriveront, je demanderai la permission d'y joindre les miens que je tiendrai touts prêts en consequence. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, vous recevrés exactement mes bulletins; je suis charmé qu'ils me donnent une occasion pour vous repeter l'assurance de mon tendre attachement.

Mille compliments, je vous prie, à Mr. de Marbois.

107 Colonel Alexander Scammell, who was wounded and captured on September 30, and who died on October 6.

108 Claude Gabriel de Choisy, in command of a brigade at Yorktown. He invested Gloucester and defeated Tarleton.

109 The battle of Eutaw Springs, September 8.

110 Rawdon. Lord Rawdon had been captured at sea by the French, on his way from Carolina to England.

LVII.

Camp devant York ce 3 octobre 1781.[111]

Votre gazetier n'a rien à dire de bien interessant, Monsieur le chevalier, et nous sommes encore occupés à debarquer l'artillerie; on a fait accomoder en notre faveur les ouvrages que les Anglais nous ont laissés; on a reconnu les autres, et nos calculs ne sont aucunement decourageants; dès que nous aurons tiré le premier coup de canon, nous pourons remettre à une quinzaine le plaisir de tirer le dernier, au moins de ce coté-ci de la riviere;

L'officier francais[112] qu'on croioit tué en sera quitte pour une cuisse coupée. Notre perte jusqu'a present se borne à une douzaine d'hommes; les anglais tirent peu, et nous ne repondons point du tout; les ingenieurs se promenent comme des sorciers en faisant des cercles autour du pauvre lord Cornwallis et les officiers generaux braquent leur lunettes en attendant l'instant d'avoir la tranchée.

On a proposé encore de faire remonter des vaisseaux. La reponse est arrivée, et je vais le savoir au quartier general, mais comme le Docteur part, je le charge de ma lettre et vous ecrirai par toutes les occasions. Beaucoup de chevaux ont passé d'York à Glocester; serois—ce une visite de Tarleton a la legion de Lauzun? Bien des gens craignent qu'une partie des ennemis ne s'echappe par terre; d'autres rient beaucoup de cette idée; je ne la trouve pas probable, mais je ne la trouve pas *impossible*; si nous avons des vaisseaux au dessus de York, alors je crois ce mouvement á peu prés impraticable; il y a tout à parier que nous les prendrons, et vous pouvés, monsieur le chevalier, à mon avis concevoir de belles esperances.

Si Mr. de Grasse renvoie tout de suite l'Engageante c'est une belle occasion pour ecrire; je joindrois mes paquets aux siens et à ceux de Mr. de Rochambeau; en attendant voici un vieux paquet que je vous prie de faire passer soit par l'Engageante soit par la premiere bonne occasion; Bien entendu qu'il faut en cas de malheur jetter à la mer; je vous envoie aussi une grande quantité de lettres dont j'ai été chargé par la division de Mr. de St. Simon.

Si ceci finit bien, monsieur le Comte, je pourrois vers le milieu de decembre faire une petite visite en France mais je voudrois bien avoir l'Hermione; j'en ecris à Mr. de Grasse et vous manderai sa response; je ne demanderai de congé que dans le cas ou je pourrois me rendre plus utile là bas qu'ici; ceci, s'il vous plait, entre nous.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, agrées je vous prie l'assurance de mon tendre attachement

Mille compliments à Mr de Marbois.

LVIII.

Camp devant York ce 12 octobre 1781[113]

Je vous demande pardon, monsieur le chevalier, si votre gazetier n'ecrit pas aussi souvent qu'il le desireroit; mais n'etant ici que trois Majors generaux il y a deux jours d'employés à monter ou à descendre la tranchée, et je ne vais gueres que le troisieme au quartier general d'ou

111 Fols. 264–265 v. A. L.

112 De Bouillet, an officer in the regiment of Agénois.

113 Fols. 266–267 v. A. L.

partent les exprés, attendu que le G'al Washington passe presque tout son tems à voir les progrés de nos ouvrages.

La premiere parallele s'est ouverte sans perte aucune, et nous avons etabli un bon nombre de bouches à feu en batteries; une bombe a brûlé le Charon et quelques autres bombes ont brûlé des batiments de transport; la nuit derniere on a ouvert sans plus de perte la seconde parallele, et nos nouvelles batteries auquelles on va commencer de travailler aujourd'huy battront les ouvrages de maniere à les mettre bientôt en très mauvais etat.

Lord Cornwallis tire peu, et paroit manquer de gros canons, peut etre même de poudre; il se reservera donc pour le tems ou nous serons plus prés de lui; quelques personnes parmi lesquelles j'ai l'Honneur d'etre ne croient pas impossible qu'il ne finisse par passer à Glocester pour prolonger de quelques jours, mais si comme il l'a dit il veut attendre l'assaut, il le recevra probablement à York; dans tous les cas, ses moyens et ses ouvrages sont trop foibles pour que ses talents et sa bravoure l'empêchent d'etre à nous avant le mois de Novembre.

On est impatient, et on crie apres les ingenieurs; les troupes des deux Nations s'ennuient de la lenteur des approches, et l'on demande d'abreger en emportant tel et tel point l'épée à la main, mais le general qui voit son succés assuré, est decidé a menager le sang de ses troupes; on n'emploiera la vive force qu'en cas de necessité; et alors je crois que nos attaques seront Brillantes.

Il y a une petite attaque à la droite des ennemis qu'on a donné au Rgt. de Tourraine; les douze autres bataillons francais montent avec les Americains; il y a un Marechal de Camp et un Major general chaque jour; le plus ancien commande, et d'aprés cela vous verrés, monsieur le chevalier, que je finis fort agreablement ma campagne.

Il y [a] toujours trois vaisseaux au bas de la Riviere; j'espere qu'on va se decider à les faire remonter au dessus d'York; on ne craint aucunement les batteries, mais on est inquiet sur les brûlots. C'est un grand point pour nous d'avoir les vaisseaux, et j'espere qu'avec des precautions la Marine se mettra hors de danger contre ses brulots; s'il le faut même, nous pourrons bientôt brûler les transports.

Adieu, monsieur le chevalier, mille compliments à Mr. de Marbois; vous connoissés mon tendre attachement.

Nos tués et blessés ne passent gueres la trentaine, tant français qu'americains.

LIX.

Camp devant York ce 16 octobre 1781[114]

Voilà notra seconde parallele bien etablie, Monsieur le chevalier, et dans cinq ou six jours les ouvrages de la place ne laisseront pas que d'etre passablement molestés; la soirée d'avant hier a été fort agreable; les ennemis avoient deux redoutes assés detachées, mais fortes qui nous convenoient parfaitement; on a formé deux attaques, celle de droite par l'infanterie legere Americaine, celle de gauche par des grenadiers et chasseurs français; vous sentés que le cœur me battoit pour la reputation de mon infanterie legere; le Baron de Viomenil avec la colonne française a fait enlever la redoute la baïonnette au bout du fusil; l'attaque des Americains n'a pas été moins prompte; ils n'avoient pas un fusil chargé, et se sont conduit egalement bien; de façon que chaque parti n'a

[114] Fols. 268–268 v. A. L.

eu que des compliments à se faire, et la même nuit nous avons appuié notre seconde parallele à la redoute des americains qui est sur la Riviere; Cette petite attaque nous epargne plusieurs jours, et donne à nos batteries les plus grands avantages.

Les troupes francaises qui ont été destinées à monter dans leur redoute etoient commandées par le Comte Guillaume des Deux Ponts; il a été blessé legerement à la fin de l'attaque; le C'l de Lameth[115] est blessé plus grievement; le Bataillon de Gimat marchoit le premier de notre coté; il a été blessé au pied mais point d'os cassé; Hamilton et Laurens etoient les deux autres Colonels du parti attaquant, et ces trois chefs se sont conduit brillament; nous nous etions promis de rendre l'affaire de New london;[116] mais l'humanité de nos soldats leur a fait oublier leurs menaces, et le Major Campbell ainsi que tous ceux qui ne se sont pas echappés ont été mieux traités qu'ils ne meritoient. Les francais ont eu environ 70 tués ou blessés, et nous une quarantaine parmi lesquels plusieurs officiers blessés.

Je m'etends sur cette petite affaire; non pour sa valeur intrinseque, mais parceque j'en mets une grande à ce que ces deux attaques faites au même instant quoique separées aient reussi de maniere à bien etablir l'estime mutuelle, et je sais que cette circonstance vous fera grand plaisir.

Les ennemis ont fait cette nuit une sortie peu considerable; tout ce que j'en sais est qu'il y a une fausse attaque sur les Americains, une vraie sur les français, quelques tués et pris de part et d'autre; on dit quelques canons encloués; les grenadiers de reserve sont arrivés, et les ennemis ont été repoussés; voilà ce qu'on m'a dit comme j'arrivois à la premiere parallele avec les premieres troupes que j'avois rassemblées du Camp, et je suis revenu pour griffoner mon petit bulletin; il part dit-on un exprés; je n'ai pas le tems d'aller au q'er g'al parceque je suis aujrd. de tranchée. Adieu.

Mille complimt. à Mr. de Marbois.

LX.

A Bord de l'Alliance ce 22 decembre 1781[117]

Ce soir ou demain, Monsieur le chevalier, et dans vingt jours nous arrivons en France; je suis sûr d'avoir vos bonnes prieres, et en revanche j'espere vous envoier de bonnes nouvelles; il n'y en a point à Boston qui vous puisse interesser; je m'etois proposé de deviner Mr. Temple,[118] mais il est si bon, qu'il a pris beaucoup de peine pour m'en eviter; c'est un ennemi, mais il n'est pas dangereux; au lieu de le combattre, il faudroit le chasser; on l'a mis dans les mains de l'attorney general, et son procés va se faire; mais peutetre la lettre de la loi le sauvera, et d'ailleurs je serois fâché qu'on le pendit, parcequ'il n'en vaut pas la

115 Charles Malo, Comte de Lameth, wounded in both legs in the assault.

116 The "affaire de New London" was the attack by Arnold on New London and Groton, on September 6. See Trumbull to Washington, September 15, in Sparks, *Letters to Washington*, III. 403. This passage is interesting in view of the charge, later made, that Lafayette ordered that no quarter should be given.

117 Fols. 270–271 v. A. L.

118 Sir John Temple, son-in-law of James Bowdoin. For the suspicions entertained respecting his visiting America at this time, see *Journals of the Continental Congress*, Feb. 27, 1782, and letter of John Adams in Wharton, IV. 638.

peine, et que je respecte son beau pere. Mon avis est qu'on le traite comme prisonnier anglais, et que le Congrés decide de son sort. Ce n'est pas ce qui peut lui arriver de plus heureux, mais c'est ce qu'il y auroit de plus sûr et de plus impartial. Vous savés combien j'aime Boston, et ce n'est jamais sans quelque regret que je le quitte; Mr. d'Etombes[119] y a été fort honnête, mais (entre nous) j'ai peur que vis a vis le pouvoir civil, ou les francais de Boston, il n'estime un peu trop les prerogatives consulaires. Comme c'est un excellent homme, si mon soupcon etoit juste, il ne seroit besoin que de les lui expliquer.

Presentés, je vous prie, mes hommages à toutes vos amies; je vous souhaitte une continuation de succés dans les negociations dont M. de la Touche vous a chargé; j'espere qu'à son arrivée il aura trouvé l'affaire faite.

Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, agrées les assurances de mon amitié; elle est bien sincere, bien tendre et ne finira qu'avec ma vie.

Mandés leur bién de nous donner de l'argeant.

Nous mettons à la voile, Monsieur le chevalier, et avant de partir je veux vous dire que M. le Consul de france est venu hier me parler de son affaire; il me paroit que le malheureux est tourmenté par une cabale de français qui peutêtre lui savent mauvais gré de les empêcher de voler; Mr. d'Etombes est un fort honnête homme et j'aurois voulu lui donner des conseils; mais ne connoissant rien à ses droits, ni au fond de l'affaire, j'ai fort approuvé qu'il n'allat pas en avant sans vos ordres, et qu'il consultat pour sa future conduite deux avocats et surtout le docteur Cooper;[120] il me paroit bien interessant que tout le monde s'entende sur la portée des prerogatives, mais je crois que le pauvre Mr. d'Etombes prend la chose plus serieusement qu'elle n'en vaut la peine; Mr. Hancock vous ecrira peutêtre a *private letter* et je l'ai approuvé en cela, pour que vous sachiés ce que pense le pouvoir civil. Adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur.

LXI.

PARIS ce 12 avril 1782[121]

C'est un convoy qui part, Monsieur le Chevalier, et c'est Mr. de Segur qui vous remettra cette lettre; voilà deux raisons pour qu'il soit inutile de vous mander des nouvelles, mais j'en trouve beaucoup davantage pour me rappeler à votre amitié, et vous dire combien je souhaitte nous embrasser à Philadelphie. Si je n'etois retenu par les affaires de l'amerique, je me reprocherois de ne pas retourner par la premiere occasion; mais dans la situation et dans l'incertitude actuelle, je crois etre moins inutile à notre cause en restant en Europe qu'en retournant dans le Nouveau Monde; je vous envoie, Monsieur le chevalier, une lettre de Mde. de Cassini dont l'affaire nous est fort recommandée par M. de Maillebois; mille tendres compliments je vous prie à Mr. de Marbois; Rappelés moi au souvenir de nos amis et Amies, et faites mention de moi à la famille en dejeuner assemblée; adieu, Monsieur le chevalier, je merite l'amitié dont vous m'honorés par celle que mon cœur vous a vouée pour la vie.

[119] Létombe, consul at Boston.

[120] Probably Dr. Samuel Cooper.

[121] Fols. *272–272* v. A. L.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain: leur Condition Juridique, Économique, Sociale. Par JEAN JUSTER, Docteur en Droit, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Paris. In two volumes. (Paris: Paul Geuthner. 1914. Pp. xviii, 510; viii, 338.)

THE magnitude of the task which the author has undertaken in an investigation of the legal, economic, and social condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire down to the reign of Justinian can be appreciated only by those who from investigations of their own in this field know something of the complexity of the problems, the nature of the sources, and the immense and scattered special literature. On a part of the ground he had as a precursor the learned work of Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (fourth ed., 1901–1909); but for the whole period and for the side of the history which Juster makes the main end of his research he has no predecessor, and even where he is on the same ground with Schürer he approaches the problems from an entirely different point of view.

The first thing to be said, then, is that we have before us a work of vast erudition and of prodigious labor. The sources are mustered to the last scrap of papyrus from an Egyptian dust-heap. The bibliography professes completeness only on points that have been insufficiently studied, for the rest a critical selection; but the selection is so ample a collection that it would be hard to find anything of consequence to add to it. What is more, it is evident on every page that the author has made use of a great part of the literature whose titles he registers. He brings to his enterprise other qualifications than laborious erudition: an advocate at the bar of the court of appeals in Paris, he is learned in Roman law by profession, and has at the same time a knowledge of Jewish law derived from Talmudic studies; it is this indeed that gives especial value to his study of a subject which has hitherto been investigated almost solely by theologians.

An introduction on a large scale (pp. 1–212) deals with the sources—literary (Jewish, pagan, and Christian), monumental (numismatic, epigraphic, papyri), and juridical—concluding with an excursus on the distribution of the Jews in the empire and their numbers. Under the head of juridical sources there is a thorough discussion of the documents (decrees of the senate, edicts of emperors and provincial officials, referring to the Jews) preserved by Josephus, over the genuineness of some of which and the date of others there has been much controversy; a table on pages 158–159 arranges them in their probable chronological order. The laws concerning the Jews in the jurisconsults and the codes are also enumerated and chronologically ordered (pp. 160 ff.). The

excursus on the Diaspora exhibits the most complete list it is possible to make of the places in the several provinces in which the residence of Jews is attested by authors, inscriptions, or papyri; the evidence itself is given in full at the foot of the page. Of the whole number of Jews in the empire in any century of this period only very uncertain estimates can be made, as Juster is perfectly aware. He is inclined to put the figures, say under Tiberius, at six or seven millions, and at about the same for the beginning of the second century before the decimating wars under Trajan and Hadrian. In this estimate, which is considerably higher than most, he seems not to apply a sufficiently high divisor to the incredible numbers of Josephus, who assembles three million pilgrims in Jerusalem at the Passover and claims for Galilee two hundred cities of above 15,000 population. In allowing Palestine alone more than five million inhabitants Juster is probably giving it much more than its proportion even of his own excessive total, and an impossibly dense population.

Coming then to the body of the work, after a preliminary discussion of the peculiar privileges accorded to the Jews in the exercise of their religion, the reasons for these concessions, and their history, the author takes up the general subject of the legal position of the Jewish communities in the dispersion and of their religion, the policy of the state toward them under the pagan emperors, and the changes in this policy after Constantine. The legislation about Jewish propaganda, conversions to Judaism, circumcision, and—after the church came to control the religious policy of the state—the laws against participation of others than Jews in Jewish worship and festivals, are fully treated. An excursus of some length (pp. 290–337) is devoted to the rival missionary enterprises of Jews and Christians, and particularly to the large Jewish influence—partly imitation, partly antipathy—upon Christian catechesis, creed, and liturgy. The matter is not strictly pertinent, and takes us somewhat far afield into the history and literature of creeds and rites. The author has evidently been much interested in this digression, in which the extent and significance of Jewish influence are, however, much exaggerated.

Returning to the subject with the protection given by the state to Jewish worship, the exemption of the Jews from the worship of the emperors, or, as Juster prefers to put it, the forms of worship they were allowed to substitute for it, claims attention. In this matter the Jews had what we might call the vested rights of a national religion, while the Christians, when they refused to offer sacrifice or burn incense to the ruler, had none. Various other privileges and immunities are enumerated, such as not being cited to appear in court on Sabbaths and festivals, exemption from military service, and the like. The central organization of the Jews in the empire with its head, the patriarch, and his subordinates; the local organization; the Jewish community as a legal person and its rights, its officers, and institutions fill the rest of the first volume.

The second volume deals with the status of the individual Jew in pri-

vate and public law at different periods and in the complex situations arising from diversities of the *status civitatis,* the jurisdiction of Jewish tribunals and the extent of their competence in Palestine and in the dispersion, and conflicts or compromises of jurisdiction between them and the other courts. Under this head the author subjects to analysis and criticism the narratives of the New Testament about the trial of Jesus, Stephen, and James the brother of the Lord, in the light of Jewish law and of the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin under Roman administration (II. 133 ff). The discussion will doubtless especially interest students of the New Testament. Juster contests the common assumption—based, indeed, on an explicit statement in the Gospel of John (xviii. 31)—that the Sanhedrin had not the power to pronounce and execute the sentence of death under Jewish law in case of religious offenses; and he points out that, if it had not the power to execute the sentence, the procedure would have been to obtain from the procurator a confirmation of the sentence and a warrant to carry it out in their own way; whereas Jesus was brought before Pilate on a political charge, and was condemned and executed as a political offender, without any reference to Jewish law or to a previous trial before the Sanhedrin. The natural inference is that the hearing of Jesus before the high priest and the others whom he summoned was not a trial at all, but was held only for the purpose of framing an accusation to lay before Pilate.

On this point, as on several others, Juster controverts Mommsen. A peculiarly interesting case is the status of the Jews throughout the empire after the suppression of the revolt and the taking of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Mommsen in his article on "Religionsfrevel nach Römischem Recht" (1890) maintained that after that event the law recognized Judaism only as a foreign religion; the Jewish nation had ceased to exist, and the civil status of all Jews was that of *dediticii.* Most Romanists have adopted Mommsen's opinion, and theologians have naturally deferred to their authority. This thesis Juster combats with arguments from both law and history. It is not for laymen to meddle in a controversy between lawyers, but the fact that Mommsen is constrained to set aside as false the testimony of Josephus that Vespasian and Titus rejected the petitions of the Alexandrians and the Antiochians to deprive the Jews of their rights of citizenship in those cities, and the fact that there is no reference anywhere to the effects of such a radical change of status upon the thousands of Jews who were citizens of Greek cities, permit the historian to doubt whether the whole Jewish people was thus degraded into the class of *peregrini dediticii.* The importance of the question lies in another: Were the Jewish communities after 70 A.D. no more than voluntary religious associations, legally on the same footing with the innumerable *collegia* for one purpose or another which the law recognized and regulated? On this point also Juster differs from Mommsen, holding that they were in the eye of the law local communities of the Jewish people and their synagogues local seats of the worship of the national God.

There is much else of varied interest in these volumes which can not here be detailed; it must suffice to mention in conclusion a chapter on Jewish names, and the chapter on the economic situation of the Jews—occupations, wealth, and the like—and the influence of the laws on this situation.

In the preface the author announces the preparation of a volume of indexes, which are necessary to make fully available the wealth of learning accumulated in this remarkable work and the publication of which will add to the debt of gratitude scholars already owe him.

GEORGE FOOT MOORE.

The Evolution of Early Christianity: a Genetic Study of First-Century Christianity in Relation to its Religious Environment. By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE, of the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature, University of Chicago. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1914. Pp. ix, 385.)

WHILE religion has long been seen in the light of historical evolution, the interconnection of early Christianity and other religious currents has rather recently become a matter of serious discussion. After the interesting contributions of French scholars like Havet and Boissier, the topic lapsed somewhat until the wealth of knowledge accumulated by classical philologians and students of comparative religion constrained theologians, particularly in Germany, to engage in the debate. One result is that enterprising young adherents of a *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* not only interpret the development of Christian worship and practice by reference to analogies in pagan religion but even begin to essay a modern reconstruction of the form and statement of Christian doctrine to correspond with the new view of origins. These efforts to see the beginnings of Christianity in relation to a general religious environment have been somewhat groping and confined to details, while the new American contribution now made by Professor Case of Chicago deserts all piecemeal discussion for a broad statement of Christian origins as "the enrichment of experience and the evolution of ideas and practices under the influence of contemporary religions" (p. 34). The point at issue is clearly put: "The primary activity which called the Christian movement into existence was not the *ab extra* insertion of some other-worldly quantity of ritual, doctrine, or ethical instruction into the realm of human experience, but an outburst of spiritual energy on the part of Jesus and his followers striving after new and richer religious attainments under the stimuli of a new and more suggestive environment." "These attainments must be estimated in terms of various individuals' response to their religious environment, their direct reaction upon their own peculiar world, and their personal conquests in the realm of spiritual experience." Dr. Case does not limit attention therefore to incidental analogies between Christian and other religious expressions or determine the possibility of the specific influence of cult upon cult. He shows the total

content of environment as tending to just those forms of religious conception which became the dominant characteristics of Christianity.

In a preliminary way Dr. Case sketches in broad, rapid outline the total cultural situation due to the expansion of Hellenism and to the Roman unification of a Hellenized world, the situation conditioning such catholic movements in religion as succeeded nationalistic types. Later chapters present more fully the result of intensive study of these religious tendencies, indicating their moulding influence on the Christian mission. In the meantime the vital connection of Christianity and Judaism and the developmental differentiation of the two furnish an illuminating and delicately judicious discussion. In this Dr. Case holds a golden mean between those who like Achelis emphasize rather exclusively the continuity with Judaism and those who like Bousset construct even Paul's conceptions in terms of adaptation to the Hellenistic world. The discussion serves indeed as a critical review of the brilliant and seductive argument of Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*.

Such a presentation obviously depends for its effect on constructive power in mastering the bewildering welter of ancient religion and on a power of sympathetic divination which can seize upon religious values in vanished forms and relate them thus to spiritual attitudes which the Christian comprehends by right of birth. Of such power the book is a shining example, as may be instanced by the chapter on the religious significance of emperor-worship. It is made to seem an historical inevitability that the Jewish Messianic movement associated with Jesus should lose its original national character and proclaim Jesus as an imperial authority with a kingdom of a spiritual and external order, as a deity by mystic union with whom believers had assurance of immortality, as mediating an emotional experience of the supernatural, as a beneficent power tranquillizing superstitious fears, as centre of a sacramental system congenial to pagan habits. The victory of Christianity is thus a case of satisfying the needs of the society in which it spread.

This admirable fruit of scholarship and historical comprehension is written in a clear sober style without literary gesture. It has a wealth of bibliographical annotation which will be of value to every special student of the subject, and the proportions and form of the presentation commend it to the general reader.

It may be doubted whether Dr. Case is equally satisfactory in his first chapter, where before arguing the moulding power of environment he sets aside the notion of a static Christian "essence" as containing from the beginning all that should be unfolded and expressed. This polemic has weight against an intellectualistic notion of "essence" as a sum of ideas, but just as he himself seems to reserve religion *per se* as an original activity not compounded out of other elements, so probably he would concede that Christianity as a high form of religion must have as a really central element psychologically the purer consciousness of this religious relationship. Distinguishing thus between the intuitive experience of

the religious object and its symbolic expression, we may be allowed to view the question of "essence" in a form incongruous with that which governs Dr. Case's antithesis of static and developmental. But this concerns the philosopher rather than the historian.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY

Customary Acres and their Historical Importance. Being a series of unfinished Essays by the late FREDERIC SEEBOHM, Hon.LL.D., Litt.D. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xiii, 274.)

DURING his last illness, Mr. Seebohm devoted himself to grouping as coherently as possible the notes made in connection with his latest researches and the result has, with cautious apology, been published by his son. Although both writer and editor were well aware of the incompleteness of the work, they rightly surmised that it would be of value to scholars—at least a contributory "essay", as Mr. Seebohm modestly liked to consider all his books.

One readily sees how he came to give attention to customary acres. Being primarily interested in the economic history of the pastoral and agricultural community, he began more than thirty years ago to inquire what light could be thrown upon its development by a study of its so-called "shell". This shell was the expanse of open field round the settlement. To explain its character he wrote what is still perhaps his best-known chapter, the one which describes the three-field system as it was practised in 1819 in his native village of Hitchin. Resorting thereafter to this type of agrarian organization as a standard for comparison, he investigated earlier and more remote usages, until, by inferring a long-continued and intimate connection between field systems and the fortunes of the community which employed them, he became the champion of the early origin of manorial lordship. After establishing, as it seemed to him, the conclusion that the open-field system in one form or another acted for centuries as a preservative shell for a tribal or village community, he next inquired whether additional arguments could not be derived from a study of the units into which a villager's holding was divided, the customary acres scattered throughout the arable fields. The book before us is the result.

As a matter of fact, the author's investigations have brought to light nothing new about the development of manorial lordship. On the contrary they have taken him afield from that topic and, as they stand, relate rather to another subject upon which he has often dwelt before. This is the character and extent of early Celtic economic usages. For the somewhat slender connecting thread of these chapters is the influence exerted by Celtic rent-paying units of tenure, and the extent to which Celtic units of linear and superficial measure can be traced throughout western Europe.

Of these two themes the latter receives more consideration. Starting with the old British mile, which is identified with the Gallic *leuga*, the author discovers that one-tenth of it constituted the length of the British customary acre. In shape this acre was ten times as long as broad, as is the entirely distinct English statute acre. With the customary acre is next identified the Armorican acre or arpent used across the Channel; both had the same superficial content, but in shape the latter was only five times as long as broad. To make the necessary adjustment, the length of the Armorican acre was so reduced that it became one-tenth of the half-diagonal of the square *leuga*. This relationship between the lengths of superficial units, whose content was the same but whose shapes were respectively one by ten and two by five, the author finds recurring in other regions of Europe and to it he often reverts in his explanations.

Having argued that, despite its double manifestation, there was a typical British-Armorican acre, Mr. Seebohm makes a pilgrimage throughout Europe to discover traces of it elsewhere. In the course of this journey we are introduced to much recondite learning. For the author examines the shape and dimensions of European acres from the Baltic to Spain and from the Black Sea to Cornwall. This dictionary of customary acres constitutes perhaps the most valuable and enduring part of the book. The generalizations, however, which become possible at the end of our progress are somewhat vague. The British-Armorican customary acre has appeared only sporadically—in Bavaria, near Venice, on the plains north of the Black Sea. Elsewhere one finds another acre, its length based upon the subdivision of a different unit of itinerary measure, the parasang. Upon these observations the author builds the hypothesis that the British-Armorican acre was the creation of the Celtic people, who, as they moved westward across Europe, left traces of their passage in the survival of this acre. In their last home on the western coast it was naturally most persistent.

The trend of such a thesis is to emphasize the importance of Celtic custom in European economic life. In keeping with this attitude are the opening chapters of the book, which have little enough concern with customary acres. They are rather a study of the areas occupied by tribute-paying groups in Ireland and Wales, the unit area being that adapted to a plough team of eight oxen and a herd of twenty-five cows. What interests the author here is the possibility that the English hide may have been derived from some such unit as this and may illustrate in its history the transition from a pastoral state of society to one of more intensive tillage. For would it not be natural that, with the growing preponderance of agriculture, the Celtic unit should shrink to the English one, and the herd of twenty-five cows dwindle to four, while the plough team remained unchanged?

It may be that we are left unconvinced by certain of the author's arguments. One feels, at times, that there is some clever sleight of

hand about the interpretation of linear and superficial measures, that, for example, the identity of the British and Armorican acres is not so complete as to unite them in contrast with most of the other acres of Europe. But the book is a stimulating one; and the differentiation between various customary acres, especially such broad distinctions as that between long acres, resultant from ploughing with the heavy plough, and square ones, resultant from cross ploughing, are of great importance. The presence of long acres, near Venice, for example, in the midst of a region characterized by Roman cross-ploughing, is significant. In its scope and erudition, the work is a fitting epilogue to the writings of a scholar who will always be remembered as the first to give due attention to the significance of Celtic custom in the early life of Europe.

H. L. Gray.

A History of England and Greater Britain. By Arthur Lyon Cross. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xiii, 1165.)

This is a text-book of more than usual importance. In the first place, it is intended specifically for college use, and there are very few college text-books of English history. Secondly, it is a scholarly work, of much thoroughness, detail, and critical judgment. Thirdly, it brings the narrative more closely down to date than any other text-book now in print. It is in the main a political history, describing the development of political and, as might be anticipated from the special knowledge and interests of Professor Cross, legal history, with such attention to ecclesiastical and economic matters as is necessary to make clear the sequence and significance of political events. On the other hand a much broader treatment of history has been introduced by means of seven or eight general chapters scattered through the book, each describing as a whole the period of which the consecutive events have just been detailed. In these excellent general chapters trade and industry, social customs, art and architecture, science, learning, and literature are treated with much fullness and interest.

We confess to finding these chapters much more interesting than those which go between and make up so much the larger part of the book, and believe that they are not only more interesting but more valuable to the student. Is it possible for anybody to remember, or indeed understand, so many detailed political changes as are described in the narrative chapters of this book? Fifty-two persons are introduced by name during the thirteen years of the reign of George I., seven statutes are either explained or alluded to, and nineteen treaties, changes of ministry, or political negotiations are described. This period is chosen simply at a venture. Professor Cross does his work of detailed narrative with great skill and mastery of the subject. But is it practicable to teach students so many things and is it desirable to make the effort?

If this chapter is typical, and there is no reason to doubt it, a student going through this book of about 1100 pages is introduced personally to something over one thousand persons, and expected to understand and even possibly to remember approximately five hundred groups of events in the nature of treaties, party combinations, the passage of statutes, or other negotiations. In real life this would be the experience of a busy life-time, not of what cannot reasonably be expected to fill more than one-tenth of a student's waking time during one year.

To obtain an enlightening and broadening familiarity with as many facts as this in such a length of time as this is in the reviewer's belief impossible. If only a short period of history is studied in one year, the question becomes not so much one of possibility as one of relative desirability; whether political changes of a minor kind have been sufficiently momentous, and the personalities sufficiently interesting, and whether their comprehension is sufficiently educative to justify putting time in on them rather than on some other things.

But these are criticisims of detailed political history as a subject of college study rather than of Professor Cross's excellent guide to such study. We are, however, somewhat inclined to doubt the wisdom of his habit of stating the main outline and significance of the events of the oncoming period at the beginning of each period. The dramatic effect of meeting events as they come is lost, and the duplication of treatment, once in general statement and again in narrative, may be confusing to the somewhat unintelligent student, if he is to be considered.

The bibliographical suggestions after each chapter are helpful and the index full. The dozen maps are useful if not handsome. It is quite remarkable how closely the material has been brought down to the very date of publication, and how the author has managed to bring in some mention of so nearly every matter of interest among the multitude of affairs of the last few years. A student who approximates a thorough knowledge of the contents of this book has a large and exact body of information concerning English history, and has had many lessons of industry and retentiveness in obtaining it.

English Economic History: Select Documents. Compiled and edited by A. E. Bland, B.A., P. A. Brown, M.A., and R. H. Tawney, B.A. (London: G. Bell and Sons. 1914. Pp. xx, 730.)

One of the first impressions received upon an examination of this book is its freshness and originality. Notwithstanding the deprecatory statement of the authors in their preface, that they have not consciously followed the "lure of the unprinted", yet a very large proportion of the 334 documents which it includes are as unhackneyed as they are apposite and suggestive. They have been found in many connections, more largely from charter rolls, legal records, chancery proceedings, local and private records, reports of Parliamentary committees, contemporary litera-

ture, and personal correspondence than from the statute book or greater documents of central government. Industry, ingenuity, and a feeling for reality are clearly shown in the discovery and choice of these documents.

An almost equally strong impression obtained is of the fullness and continuity of the documentary record of this phase of English history. No secondary work, not even the monumental work of Cunningham or the skillful outline of Ashley, recently published, to which the authors refer, makes more clear the characteristics of successive periods or the sequence of changes. It is possible by means of these selections, accompanied only by a few paragraphs of explanatory matter at the beginning of each section, to give a practically continuous narrative of the whole course of England's economic history.

Lastly, the material is interesting. The authors modestly acknowledge the precedence of constitutional and political history and the greater dignity of the collections of constitutional documents of Stubbs, Prothero, Gardiner, and Robertson. But it is to be noted, in the first place, that the two branches of history often coalesce, and it is moreover hard to see how any student upon entering on the documentary study of English history could fail to find that these documents concerning the life of the people made more of an appeal to his interest than those which explain the organization of the government. The restriction of the collection to the period before 1846 was probably necessary from motives of space. Moreover, books like Hayes's *British Social Politics* serve the same purpose for certain more recent periods and subjects. Nevertheless it is a pity not to be able to follow the story down to the present in the same form. It would show more effectively than can be done in any other way the gradual revolt against *laissez faire* ideals and the trend to a more interested, enlightened, and humane policy in the settlement of economic and social problems.

There is a certain element of sadness in many of the later documents. Not only do they give poignant testimony to the reality of much distress, but they indicate how readily much of this distress might have been avoided. The testimony of far-sighted and broad-minded men like Owen and Peel and the protests of Oastler show that the arguments which finally led to the adoption of the factory acts were brought forward a full generation earlier than the time of their acceptance. Minimum-wage acts and provisions for making employment more regular have been recently adopted, not because the conditions that demand them have only recently come into existence, but, as is clearly proved by documents in this collection, all dated more than sixty years ago, they were already urged and defended in protests and speeches that fell on the deaf ears of the early nineteenth century.

There is comparatively little in this collection illustrative of taxation and finance, and still less on foreign trade and colonization, which might fairly be considered to belong in the field of economic history; but the

fullness, variety, and interest of the collection as a whole justify many omissions and can hardly fail to give a wider and keener interest to the study of that still "neglected phase" of English history.

E. P. Cheyney.

Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127). Herausgegeben von Heinrich Hagenmeyer. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1913. Pp. x, 915.)

Hagenmeyer has been studying the crusades for about forty years. His first important work was an edition of Ekkehard's *Hierosolymita,* in 1877. In 1879 he published *Peter der Eremite,* a monograph which showed his constructive ability and gave a final estimate of Peter's connection with the first crusade. His edition of the *Gesta Francorum* appeared in 1890, followed in 1896 by the *Bella Antiochena,* and in 1901 by the *Epistulae et Chartae* for the first crusade. In the meantime he had been publishing his *Chronologie* of the first crusade and of the reign of Baldwin I. in the *Revue de l'Orient Latin.* In these books, as well as in his review articles, his attention has been directed mainly to the first crusade and, to a lesser degree, to the early years of the Latin Kingdom. No one else has ever possessed such a knowledge of the sources for the former subject, and of their interrelations; consequently he was pre-eminently fitted to prepare an edition of Fulcher.

In this volume he follows the same general method as in his preceding editions. The text is established with scrupulous care, mainly from the manuscripts which contain Fulcher's second redaction. In the edition in the *Recueil* the text is taken mainly from the codices of the first redaction. Consequently Hagenmeyer's edition furnishes a much better text and avoids errors into which earlier editors fell. Variant readings are given from fourteen codices and from all the printed editions. There are voluminous notes discussing each subject mentioned in the text, correcting errors, and giving references to other sources and to secondary works. In these notes there is also a summary in German of each paragraph; this is especially useful as the chapter headings, taken from some of the manuscripts, are inexact.

The introduction discusses at great length the life of Fulcher, his method of writing, and point of view; the character, contents, date, and sources of his chronicle; the use made of it by contemporaries and later writers; the manuscripts and printed editions; and the *Erläuterungsschriften.* The *Anhang* contains supplementary matter, including the account (wrongly ascribed to Fulcher, in Hagenmeyer's opinion) of the *Sacer Ignis* in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and a list of the biblical passages used in the chronicle. There is a bibliography of thirteen pages (the *Erläuterungsschriften,* already given on pages 111–112, are not repeated); a full chronological register; and an excellent index and glossary.

As this summary indicates, the *Historia* is edited with most pains-

taking thoroughness and everything essential is supplied. Hagenmeyer's method necessitates much repetition and some of the same facts and statements will be found in more than one place. His method also leads him to give many references of little value and thus to increase the size of his volume. But we must refrain from criticisms which are on practically the same level as looking a gift-horse in the mouth.

Fulcher's *Historia* is of especial value; not only was he in the first crusade, for which he gives a useful and generally trustworthy account, but he was the only westerner, resident in Jerusalem and participating in many of the events, who wrote a chronicle of the early years of the kingdom (*cf.* pp. v, 51, 64). And this edition supersedes all previous ones by its accuracy and thoroughness. Moreover, it supersedes to some extent the editions of other authors by Hagenmeyer himself, as he makes corrections and additions to the material contained in his earlier works. This work is the indispensable guide for all students of the subject.

DANA C. MUNRO.

Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By RUFUS M. JONES, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of Philosophy, Haverford College. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. li, 362.)

PROFESSOR JONES no longer needs introduction or commendation to students of the history of religion; and those who have read his *Studies in Mystical Religion* (1908) and his *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (1911) will at once divine that the present work forms a link between the two. Even closer is its relation to an earlier link, Mr. W. C. Braithwaite's volume on *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, published in the same series in 1912 with an introduction by Professor Jones. In that introduction he told us that his *Studies in Mystical Religion* had endeavored to trace "one powerful line of influences which helped to form the religious sects of the Commonwealth period", and that he was "now engaged upon a second volume of *Studies*", which would "trace out other great lines of formative influence, and make much clearer than heretofore the spiritual conditions and environment of that creative epoch in which Quakerism was born". This new volume he then intended to devote mainly to Jacob Boehme and his influence, and under the title of "Boehme and Other Mystical Influences" it was announced as "in preparation"; but he soon found, as he now tells us, that Boehme was no isolated prophet, but "an organic part of a far-reaching and significant historical movement". It is to the tracing of this movement "as a great side current of the Reformation" as well as to "the discovery of the background and environment of seventeenth century Quakerism" that the present work is devoted.

To Boehme and his influence, indeed, only four chapters (less than a quarter of the volume) are given. Earlier chapters deal with Hans

Denck, with Johann Bünderlin and Christian Entfelder, with Sebastian Franck, with Caspar Schwenckfeld, with Sebastian Castellio, with Coornhert and the Dutch Collegiants, with Valentine Weigel; later ones take up English mystics of the seventeenth century—Everard, Randall, Rous, Vane, Sterry, the "Latitude-Men", the Cambridge Platonists, the mystical poets. The names suggest how wide is the author's notion of "spiritual reformers", and he wisely devotes an introduction to the question "What is 'spiritual religion'?" The phrase, he reminds us, is Pauline and Johannine. The Gnostics, the Montanists, the medieval mystics, handed down the conception. But then it broadened. "Parallel with the main currents of the Protestant Reformation", says Mr. Jones, "a new type of 'spiritual religion' appeared and continued to manifest itself . . . throughout the entire Reformation era, with a wealth of results which are still operative in the life of the modern world." "The men who initiated and guided this significant undertaking—the exhibition in the world of what they persistently called 'spiritual religion'—were influenced by three great historic tendencies, all three of which were harmoniously united in their type of Christianity. They were the Mystical tendency, the Humanistic or Rational tendency, and the distinctive Faith-tendency of the Reformation. These three strands are indissolubly woven together in this type of so-called spiritual Religion." These strands he defines in their relation to religion and to each other, and points out how the men whom he is here calling Spiritual Reformers "are examples of this wider synthesis". "They all read and loved the mystics and they themselves enjoyed times of direct refreshment from an inward Source of Life, but they were, most of them, at the same time, devoted Humanists. They shared with enthusiasm the rediscovery of those treasures which human Reason had produced, and they rose to a more virile confidence in the sphere and capacity of Reason than had prevailed in Christian circles since the days of the early Greek Fathers." And they caught, too, the new message of Luther. But that message "spoke, as all Pentecosts do, to each man in his own tongue. To those who came to the Lutheran insight with a deep hunger of spirit for reality and with minds liberated by Humanistic studies, the Faith-message meant new heavens and a new earth. It was a new discovery of God, and a new estimate of man. . . . By a shift of view, as revolutionary as that from Ptolemaic astronomy to the verifiable insight of Copernicus, they passed over from the dogma of a Christ who came to appease an angry God, and to found a Church as an ark of safety in a doomed world, to the living apprehension of a Christ . . . who revealed to them, in terms of His own nature, an eternally tender, loving, suffering, self-giving God, and who made them see, with the enlightened eyes of their heart, the divine possibilities of human life. Through this insight they were the beginners of a new type of Christianity, which has become wide-spread and impressive in the modern world."

It is this threefold strand that Professor Jones tries to follow through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But it is the mystical that most appeals to him, and in the mystical that which foreshadows or explains the advent of the Quakers. Within these limits his gleaning has been alert. Entfelder is almost his discovery. And if he has not always used all the literature (on the biographical side especially he has missed things of importance), he has studied at first hand the writings of these thinkers, and to admirable purpose. Fascinating are his glimpses into the souls of these brave old individualists; clear and cogent is his tracing of their spiritual ancestry.

It is a notable contribution to a much neglected chapter of history. But there is more to do. Dr. Jones has but opened the door on these forgotten heroes of the faith. As says Mr. Edward A. George in the eloquent little book—*Seventeenth Century Men of Latitude*—which is perhaps the best complement to this one: "The men who make names for themselves are often men of extremes. Souls on fire brand history with their mark." But "too often in watching meteors we ignore the fixed stars".

GEORGE L. BURR.

Russian Expansion on the Pacific, 1641–1850: an Account of the Earliest and Later Expeditions made by the Russians along the Pacific Coast of Asia and North America; including some related Expeditions to the Arctic Regions. By F. A. GOLDER. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1914. Pp. 368.)

THE record of the extension of Russian authority in Siberia to Bering Sea, and of Russian exploration to the Northwest Coast of America forms an interesting chapter of history, especially to Americans, since our acquisition of Alaska.

This record has given rise to a voluminous literature, notwithstanding the destruction by fire at Yakutsk of a great mass of original data, in the early part of the nineteenth century.

Reports of governmental expeditions and copies of a multitude of other papers fortunately exist in the archives at Petrograd, where the author of this volume has made researches. He was also able to examine the Delisle manuscripts at Paris, though the latter seem to have afforded little of importance.

The author's sketch of Russian administration in Eastern Siberia is followed by a discussion of the relations between Russia and China on the Amur River before 1689. A critical examination of Deshneff's explorations about Bering Strait comes next, in which the author discredits them, but the argument partakes too much of the nature of special pleading to be convincing.

Chapters on Kamchatka, on the Kuril Islands, and on the "Land of Yesso" follow, with a very full account of Bering's first expedition to the strait which bears his name. Another chapter treats of the Chukchis

and the discovery of the American coast opposite their peninsula, followed by one on Bering's second expedition. The last chapter gives by far the most complete account of the detailed exploration of the Arctic coast of Russia and Siberia which is anywhere available in English. The text is followed by a number of appendixes in which historical documents of more or less importance are reproduced. A scant bibliographical note, with a very amateurish bibliography and a far too restricted index, complete the volume, which is illustrated by reproductions of several ancient maps and one document.

On the whole we are indebted to the author, who has brought together in English a multitude of facts from scattered sources and from unpublished documents relative to this region, which will now be available to the curious reader.

That the work is not that of a well-trained historian is evident. The comprehension which might be expected from a real explorer of those regions is not unnaturally wanting. The author is earnest in his contention that the primitive hunters who gave to Russia half a continent by almost incredible hardships, were "very ordinary men" of deplorable morals. There is some truth in this, and the same might be said of their compeers in the forces of Drake, Hawkins, and Sir Henry Morgan. Nevertheless there is something in their primitive human nature and their exploits which stirs a ripple in one's blood.

A better comprehension of the East Siberian dialect would have prevented such semi-misconceptions as "walls" for "stockades", and "leather" for "raw seal-hide". Some knowledge of navigation as practised in the region would have cancelled such errors as the assumption that the sailing distance from the Kolyma River to East Cape is 1115 nautical miles (really about 680); from East Cape to the Anadyr River 1045 miles (really about 450); or "across Holy Cross Bay not less than 500 miles" (really about 60).

The transliteration of Russian names, though credited to the method of the United States Hydrographic Bureau, is largely inconsistent, neither phonetic nor correct. In short the book, while containing much of value to the historian and giving evidence of much conscientious labor, is lacking in the workmanship to be expected from a trained expert.

A Journal of the First Two Campaigns of the Seven Years' War. Written in French by Horace St. Paul, Aide de Camp and Colonel of Cavalry in the Imperial Austrian Army, Count of the Holy Roman Empire. Edited by George Grey Butler, M.A. (Cambridge: University Press. 1914. Pp. lxiv, 432.)

Horace St. Paul, a young Englishman of good family, took service with Maria Theresa on the outbreak of the Seven Years' War, and distinguished himself as a soldier. He was at Prague and at Leuthen and at most of the great battles fought between the Austrian and the Prus-

sian armies. He became a colonel at twenty-nine, and in the same year, 1759, a count of the Empire. His journal of the campaigns of 1756 and 1757, long preserved in the family archives, is now published by Mr. George G. Butler, who had already, in 1911, printed some interesting papers belonging to a later period of St. Paul's life.[1] It may be noted that the two beautiful portraits reproduced in the present volume appeared in the earlier book.

The *Journal* is the work of a man new to the profession of arms, but anxious to learn, keen in his observations, and with the qualifications of a soldier. It is one of the most valuable documents yet published on the military events of 1756–1757, because of the many details which it contains. It is in this respect that the *Journal* has value, as will be shown presently; it does not deal in large appreciations, like General Lloyd's masterly exposition of the strategy of the Seven Years' War, at the opening of the first volume of his history;[2] nor does it narrate the campaigns fully—for in 1757 we find no mention of Rossbach, and only a passing reference to Gross Jägerndorf. The author is chiefly concerned with what passes under his own observation or with what may assist him professionally. What he actually records is the string of events of which the important points are: Lobositz, Prague, Kolin, the siege of Schweidnitz, Breslau, and Leuthen.

On Leuthen, St. Paul throws additional light of more than usual interest. The success of Frederick's well-known manoeuvre in that battle depended on his getting deployed easterly from Lobetinz before the Austrians should have time to form a line facing him in that unexpected direction. It was therefore part of the game to keep them at their full extension and expecting an attack on their opposite flank as long as possible. How did Frederick effect this? Hitherto the specific facts have been missing. The Austrian relation says: "The enemy made several motions sometimes to the right, sometimes to the left, which lasted till 12 o'clock." General Lloyd is a little more definite: "The King made great demonstrations against their right by which they were deceived." But St. Paul clears up the whole matter. In his map of the battle he places three Prussian units, presumably three battalions of the advance guard, as far over as a thousand yards northwest of Nippern. This position explains much of what happened in Frederick's most famous victory.

The battle and subsequent blockade of Prague are narrated at considerable length, and incidentally a great deal of valuable information is given on the command of the Austrian army. The regimental officers were almost wholly untrained and poor. The higher command was unevenly composed of high-born amateurs not always well suited to the career, and of professionals, often enough soldiers of fortune, among

[1] George G. Butler, *Colonel St. Paul of Ewart: Soldier and Diplomat* (London, Nisbet and Company, 1911).

[2] General Lloyd, *History of the late War in Germany* (London, 1766–1790, 3 vols.).

them a good number of Irishmen. Marshal Browne stands out vigorously and well; Duke Charles of Lorraine quite moderately; Marshal Daun, if the quality of his officers and that of Frederick's be kept in mind, may have been a much better general than usually appears.

The technical services of the Imperial and Royal army were almost non-existent, save for the artillery arm to which Daun gave great numerical expansion. French engineers from the army of Soubise had to be borrowed to conduct the siege of Schweidnitz. Among the documents copied by St. Paul none are more important than the memoirs of d'Hallot and de Boisgelin to Duke Charles containing instructions for sorties and other siege operations at Prague; one of these contains a specially interesting example of the *ordre mixte*.

Many incidents are connected with recruiting and desertion, concerning which we have the following amusing passage under date of November 26, 1757:

Depuis le commencement de la campagne on donnait un ducat à chaque déserteur, mais on prit trop peu de précautions en les renvoyant en arrière. Les trois quarts après avoir reçu leur ducat et leur passeport, faisaient un détour de 5 à 6 lieues et ensuite retournaient chez le roi de Prusse. À la fin de la campagne il se trouva qu'on avait donné 20,000 ducats.

With the editor's work there is little fault to find. The book is enriched with over sixty maps and plans, all contemporary and some of them excellent and containing important information. Some of the small sketch plans drawn by St. Paul are far from accurate, however, notably that of the camp before Nusel (p. 96). Mr. Butler may perhaps more legitimately be reproached for failing to work out scales of distance, thus putting the reader to serious inconvenience.

R. M. Johnston.

George the Third and Charles Fox: the Concluding Part of the American Revolution. By the Right Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, Bart., O. M. Volume II. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xii, 433.)

In the simple and unaffected preface, the author tells us that "This second and final volume of *George the Third and Charles Fox* brings to a close the series of six volumes of which the first four are entitled *The History of the American Revolution.*" "They have been", he says, "my main occupation ever since I left the House of Commons in the spring of 1897". We may doubt whether any seventeen years of the last half-century has witnessed the beginning and completion of an historical masterpiece so fortunate in its theme, and so perfect in its execution. It is a most maddening book to review because one can never bring one's self to lay it down in order to write the review. One of the great charms of the work is that there is absolutely nothing of the pedagogue in the manner of telling the story. It results that the

book is not so much a place to learn history as a place to enjoy it. Things of great moment are told in so casual and easy a style, and the reader is so little warned by an impressive and pedagogical manner, that their importance is often not noted. No pointing finger and loud thundering in the index wakes the lagging attention, and bids the unwilling guest to the feast. It is the charm of the alluring muse, and not the glittering eye of the Ancient Mariner, that fixes the attention.

Except for the use of the Charles Fox manuscripts, there is practically no employment of archive materials, yet so perfect is the mastery of all printed sources, the letters and diaries and speeches of men, the government reports, the newspapers and pamphlets, and the monographic productions in the period, that the critical reader's confidence is seldom lost. Only when the hidden motives of governmental action are in question is failure to make use of the archives manifest. The diplomatic correspondence of James Harris, as distinguished from the selections contained in the Malmesbury *Diaries and Correspondence,* would have corrected Trevelyan's idea, surely vague, and apparently wrong, of the motives which led England to declare war on Holland, and work in the Archives of Foreign Affairs in France, rather than dependence on Doniol, would have made firmer his grasp of the motives which determined France to make an open alliance with the United States. Nevertheless, we wonder whether even the highly trained historical reader will not gain more real understanding of the conditions and motive forces of the revolutionary period from Trevelyan's comprehensive synthesis of easily accessible facts, whose relation had, in many cases, not hitherto been perceived, than from the wearisome pages of some diligent, brain-fagged investigator who drags, blinking, from the darksome archives, a wholly new fact which he has not the art to make common knowledge. Of course we must have both varieties of historians if we are to make progress toward absolute truth, but all too widespread is the fashion of regarding lightly work like this, of which only one man in a generation is capable, while looking with a superstitious and academic awe upon a host of learned monographs buried knee-deep in foot-notes straight from the archives.

His presentation of economic history does not offer that solid accomplishment found in some well-known, melancholy monographs, but we wonder if he does not come much nearer conveying the truth to the mind of the gentle reader, and with infinitely less strain on that reader's gray matter and credulity. There is another and deeper knowledge which can come only from long participation in affairs, from close contact with men who are directing governmental affairs, and from a life somewhat evenly divided between men and books. We detect these experiences in the author's understanding of election contests, of the personal and sentimental motives that actuated the voters, in his acquaintance with the dignified contemporary anecdote, and with the traditions of great families, with, indeed, all the interweaving social forces, which after all

shape our ends rough, hew them as the economists will. And yet he is not unmindful of the economic forces, and though never finding in them the whole solution of his historical problem, he gathers facts about the conditions of the working-people, the finances of the English landlords, the damaged trade of the merchants, the halted mills of the manufacturers, and gives them their proper and reasonable place among the influences which were driving governments or peoples to the course which history records that they took.

We are particularly struck with the acquaintance with men and events of that and other ages, so that the allusive element in his style not only lends charm, but inspires confidence. Who but a master spirit could divide in twain and play not only on the present theme but upon all associated facts of the past and future? His ready knowledge of what Burke did long after this period of history, and what Pitt did long before, of parallels in Greek history, and of contrasts in that of America, is most impressive. Perhaps one of the best citations to illustrate this charm of allusion is his description of a speech, where "Pitt was thundering away like a re-incarnation of that terrible cornet of horse who, five-and-forty years before, had been too much for the nerves of Sir Robert Walpole."

Many of the pictures of high life in the political circles of that time are worthy of the author of *Vanity Fair*. The company at Brooks's as described in the chapter on Fox and the new Parliament reveals this charm in one of its most attractive aspects. The author's jibes at Tory statesmen or their henchmen are a delight, if you do not happen to be a Tory. One was "a bully always and everywhere, and a duellist, or a pugilist, according to the social rank of his antagonist, and the nature and scene of the quarrel in which he happened to be engaged". The Bedfords are described as holding that "the first and last object of a sensible public man was to get hold of public money; and they preached on that theme with engaging frankness, and with as near an approach as they ever made to religious unction". Another "in his close-buttoned suit of purple cloth . . . showed a bluff and resolute visage, with a complexion ripened by the pick of fifty vintages, which matched the color of his costume". Quite the opposite of Dr. Johnson, Trevelyan always sees to it that the Tory dog gets the worst of it. Some of his characterizations of individuals seem too clever to be true, but when he says of Weymouth that "Of all functions in politics he was the least fitted for that which he was called upon to exercise", and that "the Foreign Minister of England in that day of England's need was regarded as little better than a nullity in all the Chancelleries of Europe", we feel that he has been neither too clever nor too harsh. Of Selwyn, who said his pillow was his only resource to escape listening to Fox, Trevelyan writes: "Undoubtedly, bed was the best place for a man some years past sixty, who had drunk two bottles of wine every day of his life since he was a brilliant and graceless undergraduate at Oxford."

This searching wit and keen insight into human motives and foibles is not devoted to Tory statesmen alone. Speaking of Catherine II. and Frederick the Great, he dryly remarks: "They had been partners—and, when they saw occasion for it, accomplices and fellow conspirators,—in enterprises of great moment of which some were laudable, and almost all were lucrative." Relating that a German baron in Philadelphia assured his Whig friends that the King of Prussia was "A great man for liberty", Trevelyan says, with perfect truth, "never was a sentiment more strictly platonic than Frederick's affection for the cause of American freedom".

In this final volume as in the preceding ones, we have an English Whig's history of the American Revolution. This is not to say that he is not sympathetic with the colonial cause, for, indeed, he is often more generous in his sympathy than American writers of recent vintage, but his interests are in the English problems of that time. This is as it should be, and to those who enjoy the history of a rich and varied political and social life, it is more interesting than the study of the seeds and small beginnings of American political and social institutions. Trevelyan's account of the formation of the County Associations (December, 1779)—"a political agitation on a scale surpassing anything which was reached until the crisis of the Reform Bill of 1832"—is intensely interesting, but not the kind of thing which would have caught the eye and employed the pen of an American historian of the American Revolution. The same may be said of the interesting controversy involving the "lords lieutenants", of the account of "the city and the loan", of "Lord North and the tax-payer", and of the "General Election" of 1780. The American war is described, and there are pictures of American social conditions, but the embryonic American institutions are either untouched, or only vaguely suggested. The only regret that this final volume leaves with us, is that we can no longer enjoy that pleasurable anticipation which all the preceding volumes have afforded.

C. H. Van Tyne.

The Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1805–1840. Edited by his son, Rollo Russell. In two volumes. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1913. Pp. 319, 314.)

Perhaps the most striking impression conveyed by a perusal of Lord John Russell's letters is that of the youthfulness of the writer. Possibly this is true in part because considerable space is given to the very early letters, but it must also be true that a certain buoyant boyishness characterizes a very large number of the selections. These early letters are printed for the first time, and are extremely interesting, especially as Russell, from childhood, regarded himself as a statesman in the making. Not only did he accept, as a matter of course, his destiny as a political leader, but, from the beginning, he displayed a singleness of purpose in political life, which marked his whole career. Upon the re-

form of the franchise, in some fashion, he had thought and written much before he was twenty, and letters to him during these early years show how keenly he was being watched by prominent men in English public life. The time was ripe for just such an eager, earnest reformer.

The editor gives a fair summary of the condition of England in Russell's boyhood and then quotes from Sir George Trevelyan, apropos of the period 1790–1825, the following:

> For the space of more than a generation, from 1790 onwards, our country had, with a short interval, been governed on declared reactionary principles. . . . Fear, religion, self-interest, ambition—everything that could tempt and everything that could deter—were enlisted on the side of the dominant opinions. . . . To profess Liberal opinions was to be excluded from all posts of emolument, all functions of dignity. . . . No motive but disinterested conviction kept a handful of veterans steadfast round a banner which was never raised except to be contemptuously swept down. . . . The Press was gagged. . . . Every speech which a Crown lawyer could torture into a semblance of sedition sent its author to jail, to the hulks, or the pillory. . . . It was vain to appeal to Parliament for redress against packed juries and panic-driven magistrates. . . . Attendance at an open meeting for parliamentary reform was as dangerous as night poaching.

Russell's family belonged, indeed, to the party in opposition, the party of proposed Parliamentary reform, and the boyish letters show that, from the earliest moment, while in school and later at Edinburgh University, Russell manifested an intense interest in the franchise. The first letters quoted were written at the age of thirteen, and, from that time on, he is found expressing opinions on political matters and mature subjects, such as are indeed remarkable even from a boy believing himself ordained to political leadership. In 1810, when but eighteen years old, he wrote, apparently for private use, a review, "The Whig Register", several numbers of which still exist. In 1811 he prepared a long article on "Extension of the Franchise", and, in 1813, while still under age, he was first elected to Parliament.

The preceding six or seven years had been a period of invaluable experience and opportunity. He had made the acquaintance of Fox, Holland, and the leaders of the Whig party, and before he was twenty he had been at home in the best society of London, Edinburgh, and Dublin; he had travelled upon the Continent, had ridden with Wellington along the line of Torres Vedras, had visited Napoleon at Elba, and had done some desultory writing. A volume of essays and sketches were published about 1815, the *Life of William Lord Russell* was published in 1819, while sundry articles and reviews appeared during the same years. His political engagements were naturally less confining than later on, and he impressed many men of letters as showing noticeable promise. With Tom Moore, the Irish poet, he was on terms of the closest intimacy throughout his life.

Russell's tours abroad were planned by his father as a part of his

political training, and his vacation travels in England were also arranged for their educational opportunity. For instance, there was a carefully scheduled journey among the manufacturing towns of northern England. This tour was made in company with Professor Playfair of Edinburgh, that Russell might know, at first hand, their industrial conditions. It is hardly necessary to say that Whig opposition saw its best opportunity in these manufacturing centres, and hoped for increased influence there through franchise extension. Almost with a sense of guardianship, certainly with a sense of approaching political sponsorship, leaders of the Whig party wrote to Russell letters of advice and suggestion. Not only did they attempt to expound political principles as a basis of public conduct, but they, especially his father, outlined specific fields of political activity where Russell's ability would be most serviceable.

Entering Parliament at the close of the Napoleonic Wars, he undertook the immediate campaign for franchise extension, believing that England's good fortune in the war would bring a wider sympathy for Parliamentary reform. It was no difficult matter, however, for powerful political opponents to hamper the opposition and to prevent favorable action. Russell was energetic, eager, capable, but greatly handicapped by youth and inexperience, and after several years of earnest effort, became thoroughly discouraged, and prepared to desert politics for literature. The influence of family and political friends, however, was uniformly against this decision, and when the reform movement again came to the front, he was in his accustomed place.

For the reform movement itself there is surprisingly little correspondence in these volumes; practically nothing is added to our knowledge of Russell's activities or influence. The editor attributes this to the very intensity of the Parliamentary battle, and the burden of official duties which came with the accession of the Whig party to power.

Indeed, save for the early years of political life, there is no new light upon Lord John. The volumes, while readable and interesting, add little to historical knowledge. The type, the training, and the youthful environment of a man of Russell's achievements it is important to understand; and his character, in its formative period, is brought out in these letters.

There are rather more letters from Russell's correspondents than from Russell himself, and one from Lord Holland urging upon Russell the duties of peacemaker attracts attention. Writing confidentially, in January, 1831, and proclaiming neutrality to be Britain's only rôle, he says: "Pray say what you think on this matter, not to me but to others. You begot the neutrality of Belgium, beget the peace of the world."

An appendix of twenty pages gives an excellent and condensed series of biographical sketches of correspondents. The index of names is adequate; that of subjects covers but two pages and is altogether too brief to be of any real service.

The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. By William Flavelle Monypenny and George Earle Buckle. Volume III., 1846–1855. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. x, 591.)

The third volume of the *Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield,* covers only the years from 1846 to 1855. It begins with the break-up of the old Tory party after the adoption of free trade by Peel, and ends with the collapse of the Aberdeen coalition government in January, 1855. Brief as is the period covered it is doubtful whether in the whole range of English political biography from the American Revolution to the great war of 1914–1915, there is a more strikingly interesting or, what is more important, a more revealing volume. Except for the Earls of Derby and Malmesbury and Bentinck, Disraeli had no colleagues of prominence in the Conservative party in the years from 1846 to 1855 whose achievements in or out of Parliament warranted a detailed biography. It was the most disorganized, futile, and barren period in the history of Toryism from the death of Pitt to the break-up of the Liberal party over Gladstone's Home Rule bill of 1886. Bentinck died in 1848, and Disraeli was his biographer. There is a life of Malmesbury; but so far there has been no official life of Derby, no life that embodies any of Derby's correspondence; and nothing of either memoirs or history takes the edge off this third volume of the life of the remarkable man who was Derby's colleague in the leadership of the Conservative party in its years of disruption and weakness.

The first two volumes of the Disraeli biography, it will be recalled, were written by the late Mr. Monypenny, who died in November, 1912, within ten days after the publication of the second volume. Except for chapter II.—an analysis of Tancred—the third volume is entirely the work of Mr. Buckle; and Mr. Buckle has handled the eventful period of Disraeli's life from 1846 to 1855—and also this extremely intricate period in the history of the Whig, the Peelite, and the Liberal and Radical parties—with such complete success that his readers will fervently hope that the war will cause no delay in the publication of a fourth and concluding volume.

A Whig administration succeeded the government of Peel in July, 1846. Russell was Premier, and Palmerston Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Russell desired a coalition with the Peelites, who then numbered nearly a hundred members in the House of Commons. His overtures were, however, declined by Dalhousie, Lincoln, and Herbert. Peel was concerned only with keeping the protectionists out of office, and was anxious not to take the government again. As the Whigs, Radicals, and Irish who followed Russell, all told, did not constitute half the House, the strength of the new ministry lay in the support of the Peelites, and in the absence of well-organized or effective opposition either in Parliament or in the constituencies. Derby, then Lord Stanley, was the leader of the protectionists, with Lord George Bentinck as his

lieutenant in the House of Commons; and from July, 1846, until the end of the session, the protectionists retained their seats on the government side of the House.

In the Parliament of 1841–1847 Disraeli was one of the members for Shrewsbury. At the general election he transferred himself to Buckingham—the shire in which his father had his home, and in which, after his purchase of Hughenden Manor in 1847, Disraeli himself lived until his death in 1881. Disraeli was elected a knight of the shire without a contest. His address to the electors of Buckingham is memorable as a statement of his political views and convictions at a time when he was easily foremost in the uphill work of reorganizing the old Tory party. He deprecated any precipitous or factitious attempt to repeal the free-trade measures of 1846. "The legislative sanction which they have obtained", he declared, "requires that they should receive an ample experiment". He was in favor of placing the education of the people in the hands of the clergy, "their legitimate guides and instructors"; and he was emphatic in his adhesion to the alliance of Church and State. He held that Liberalism set class against class, exalted political economy at the expense of human nature and patriotism, and insisted that the Tories must be the popular party as opposed to doctrinaire Liberalism.

Disraeli by no means abandoned protection as early as 1847; for in a speech at Aylesbury he predicted that Parliament after a fair, full, and ample trial of free trade would be driven to abandon it from absolute necessity. It would take this step, Disraeli assured his electors, "at the termination of much national suffering"; "but that suffering", he added, "will be compensated for by the bitterness and the profundity of national penitence". Mr. Buckle is of the protectionist party in England. His sympathies are obviously with the cause which Derby, Malmesbury, Bentinck, and Disraeli, and what was then known as the country party, represented at the election of 1847; and his comment on Disraeli's prophecy is that "the trial has been fuller and more ample than Disraeli anticipated, but it is evident that the end is not yet". The protectionists met with no response to their appeal to the electors in 1847. The Whigs and their supporters and the Peelites were in a majority in the new House of Commons; and the first session of the new Parliament saw Derby again leading the protectionists in the Lords, Bentinck leading the party in the Commons, and Disraeli, who had abandoned the motley garments of his early years, on the front opposition bench with Bentinck.

Bentinck retired at the end of the first session of the new Parliament. He broke with the country and Protestant party over his speech and vote in favor of the government bill for the removal of Jewish disabilities. Never since the Tory party came into existence, never since party lines were clearly drawn in Parliament and Whigs and Tories occupied benches on opposite sides of the House of Commons, was the Tory party more bereft of men of ability in the Lords and in the Commons

than in the years from 1846 to the incoming of the Palmerston administration in 1855. Derby and Disraeli were the only men who could command an audience either in or out of Parliament. That Disraeli should succeed Bentinck as leader in the Commons was as obvious as the great chair in which the Speaker is enthroned. But Disraeli was still regarded by many Conservatives as an adventurer; he was deeply in debt; Derby distrusted him and kept him at a distance; and the queen was not yet disposed to overlook his conduct towards Peel in the closing months of Peel's last tenure of office. The result was that when Bentinck resigned, the leadership of the country party in the House of Commons was put in the charge of a committee of three—Disraeli, the Marquis of Granby, and Herries, who had been Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Goderich administration of 1827–1828. The plan was an impossible one. The committee soon abandoned its weekly meetings. For all practical purposes the plan had collapsed before the end of 1848; and on February 22, 1849, Disraeli wrote triumphantly to his sister, "after much struggling I am fairly the leader". Complete and cordial recognition from the Conservative party was delayed for some months; but in March, 1849, Disraeli was regarded by Russell and his colleagues of the treasury bench as leader of the opposition, and on the 16th of that month Russell in his nightly Parliamentary letter to the queen informed her Majesty that Disraeli showed himself a much abler and less passionate leader than Bentinck.

Disraeli had at last arrived. But when Bentinck had tried the strength of the country party in the House of Commons in the first session of the new Parliament, he could muster only 120 followers. There had been no accessions to it between 1847 and 1849; and when Disraeli assumed the lead Derby and the Conservatives were still committed to protection. The country was prosperous and would give no heed to the cry for a return to protection. The party had no other policy. It had scarcely a corporal's guard of men of either Parliamentary or platform ability, and it was poorly served in the press. It is at this point—after Disraeli became leader of the Conservatives in the Commons—that Mr. Buckle's volume becomes so valuable. The letters of Derby, Disraeli, Malmesbury, Londonderry, and also of the Conservative whips, are copiously drawn upon; and from these can be learned more about Derby's ability and shortcomings as a leader than from any other volume of political memoirs, as well as of the great difficulties that confronted Disraeli between 1849 and the downfall of the coalition ministry in 1855. These grew out of his past and of his relentless hostility to Peel in the Parliament of 1841–1847. Other more serious difficulties developed out of the poverty of the Conservative party in men of Parliamentary ability; out of the stubbornness with which Derby clung to protection, and his unwillingness either to retire from the leadership of the party or to make a serious effort to give it an effective lead. Still another difficulty was the lack of any constructive policy. The party

was floundering from 1846 to 1855; and much of the interest of this third volume is in the new light that it throws on the history of the Whig and Peelite parties as well as on the internal organization and drifting of the Conservatives in the decade that followed the downfall of Peel.

Mr. Buckle makes no attempt to conceal his own political convictions. They crop out, as has been noted, when he is concerned with protection, and again in writing of democracy and taxation. In view of the heavy contributions to taxation which the working classes of the United Kingdom have made through the revenue duties on beer, tobacco, and tea, and especially in view of the willingness of the Labor party in the war session of 1914 to extend the income tax to wage-earners, there is not much ground for Mr. Buckle's lament that the tendency of democracy "to exempt almost entirely from taxation the classes who hold political power fills political philosophers with disquiet for the future". But no possible objection can be made to a biographer infusing a little of himself into his work, and nothing but praise can be accorded Mr. Buckle's first volume of the Disraeli biography; for he has given us a book that can be read from beginning to end with the keenest interest by people who have never had volumes I. and II. in their hands and who may have no expectation of reading volume IV.

Edward Porritt.

Report of the International Commission to inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Intercourse and Education, Publication No. 4.] (Washington, D. C.: Published by the Endowment. 1914. Pp. 413.)

When in the course of the second Balkan War the newspapers reported that a commission was to be sent by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to investigate the Balkan atrocities on the spot, many readers wearily shrugged their shoulders over the announcement. *Cui bono?* The misdeeds had been done, the dishonored dead would not return to life, and as long as the moral and racial conditions of the peninsula remained what they were, the outrages were sure to be repeated in the future regardless of the most convincing statistics and the most moving homilies. Over a year has passed and now the *Report* of the commission is submitted to the public. The most indifferent sceptic who reads it with open mind will be forced to grant that here is a body of material collected with single-minded attention to the truth and that, though done is done and all our tears will not blot out a single wrong, it was yet worth while to bring together all this material while it was fresh and throbbing which goes to prove how ruthless man may become in pursuit of an idea. For it was the idea of national greatness that caused this orgy of Balkan crime. The members of the commission were eight in number, who came from six great neutral coun-

tries and were all qualified by character and training to make some special contribution to the investigation. They travelled widely through the peninsula getting a first-hand view of everything, they interrogated hundreds of people of every nationality and station, and in addition to printing as appendixes an enormous body of evidence, they co-ordinated their findings in intelligent and absolutely fair-minded essays treating such matters as the Non-combatant Population, the War and the Nationalities, the War and International Law, and so forth.

What are the commission's conclusions touching the main issues with which their investigation was concerned? First place may be conceded to the atrocities—the *causa movens* of the enterprise. Without the shadow of a doubt genuine and terrible atrocities were committed by all the combatants—Turks, Servians, Bulgarians, and Greeks. The judgment implicates the Bulgarians with the rest but is none the less a kind of vindication of that people. For, cut off for the length of the war from the rest of Europe, the Bulgarians were accused by all their enemies whom the control of the telegraph lines permitted to retain the ear of Europe, of the exclusive practice of every conceivable horror. In view of the fact that the Greeks were particularly vociferous in this denunciation (telegram of King Constantine of July 12) the neutral reader may derive some just satisfaction from the discovery that the *Report* gives them a blacker record than the enemy whom they slandered. Their doings at Strumnitsa are perhaps the most revolting page in the whole terrible tale (pp. 106–108). But this acknowledgment should not be construed as meaning that any other people's record is appreciably better. Next as to Macedonia, the prize for which the wars were fought. By reason of their final victory recorded in the treaty of Bucharest the Greeks and Servians took over the bulk of the conquered territory and by the most brutal military pressure immediately attempted to "convert" the native Bulgarian population to either the Greek or Servian nationality. The evidence on this head is overwhelming and is even more revolting than the crimes committed in the heat of open conflict, for these conversion tactics were applied from day to day in cold blood and, we must believe, are employed at this hour as vigorously as ever. Under these circumstances "the conclusion is forced upon one, that in so far as the treaty of Bucharest has sanctioned the illegitimate claims of victorious nationalities, it is a work of injustice which in all probability will fail to resist the action of time" (p. 206). And finally on the greatest moral canker of the peninsula, the excessive nationalist passion of all the populations, the commission offers this weighty opinion: "We regard as just and legitimate, we even admire the deeds . . . by which nationality defends its existence. . . . But when these same nationalities pass from the defensive to the offensive, and . . . begin to impinge on the existence of another national individuality, they are doing something illicit, even criminal" (p. 206).

FERDINAND SCHEVILL.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Party Government in the United States. By WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE. Seth Low Professor of History, Columbia University. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1914. Pp. xvii, 451.)

THIS is a compact résumé of the history of American parties and of the American Congress from the adoption of the Constitution to the present time. Intermingled with this historical summary are brief discussions on some large themes in government, politics, and law—such as representation and suffrage; the doctrine of equality; the origin and character of American parties, and their relation to civil liberty, democracy, and social cleavage; the nature of the presidency and other departmental functionaries of the American government; the Constitution and its relation to popular sovereignty and loose construction; together with the party convention system and the relation of parties to state and city government. This description and partial list of topics indicate the immensity of the subject which Professor Sloane has attempted to treat within the limits of less than 400 pages. The extensive appendix of over fifty pages includes the Articles of Confederation; the Constitution of the United States; the dates of the admission of the states; the successive presidential candidates of all parties since 1789, with their respective popular and electoral votes; the population of the slave and free sections at every decennial census, with their Congressional representation; and the cabinet officers of the successive administrations. This affords very useful material for purposes of reference.

The scope of the volume is too large for its limits. To elementary readers it will prove to be confusing and to advanced students unsatisfying, though in many places suggestive. The extremely condensed character of the volume is accounted for by the statement that it is an elaboration of a course of lectures delivered in the universities of Berlin and Munich while Professor Sloane was acting as American Roosevelt Professor in Germany. These young Germans of the universities, no doubt, have been well disciplined and they may have been able to attack, conquer, and digest the great army of related facts with which the volume is fortified. The American sophomore will probably not fare so well in his attempt to arrange this material in his mind. The multiplicity of events will worry and discourage him. While the volume seems singularly free from positive error of statement (considering the multitude of events that are dealt with) yet on almost every page the reader stands in need of further elaboration and explanation. On one page we find the 28th Congress with "a Democratic majority in both houses"; on the following page (p. 129) "the expiring Republican majority" of the same Congress, "voted hitherto unheard-of sums for different internal improvements". Is this an error of statement or does the author intend the reader to understand that in that era of party his-

tory, the party names "Democratic" and "Republican" were identical? Space is needed for explanation. A chapter is devoted to the "Republican Party" of 1845–1846.

On many other pages it will be seen that the attempt to pack so much information on so many large subjects within such narrow compass has its drawbacks and dangers. Matters are left unexplained and half-told, with misleading results. This may be illustrated by Professor Sloane's treatment of the origin of the Republican party: "In the year 1856 was formed the third loose-construction party. It took the name of Republican. Its program included protection, internal improvements, a national-bank currency and the control by Congress of slavery within the Territories" (pp. 191–192). This tells the story of the new party, of its genesis and its purposes. If the passage is intended as a swift stroke of the brush to portray ten or twenty years of party history in a broad general way, it may find some apology; but as to instruction, for young or old, it is inadequate and seriously misleading. The new party had its origin in 1854: to prevent slavery in the territories was its primary purpose—everything else was incidental; protection was not one of its party tenets until six years later, and a national-bank currency, or the bank issue, was not within the scope of the party programme at all: and, as a matter of fact, in its early years the Republican party (while out of power) was disposed to fall back on the strict construction and the states'-rights, compact view of the Constitution, as is to be seen in the attitude of Sumner and Chase and others in their opposition to the exercise of national power for the recovery of fugitive slaves, as also in the case of Booth in Wisconsin and the Wellington rescue in Ohio. It would seem that such a notable period in party history really demands, in almost any book on the subject, more attention than Professor Sloane was able to give to it in the space at command. Better proportion by elimination elsewhere would have helped.

Such are the faults of the volume. It has its merits. It is a marvel that the author has been able to crowd so many things within its pages. It is a compendium of suggestions and topics which a student may wish to trace out or look up, though the volume itself would help none, since it gives no references or citations. It is a laborious and able compilation by an eminent and highly respected author whose name will carry weight; but it is made up from secondary sources and those altogether too few in number to bring to the volume the advantage that might have come from a wider reading. It is based largely, as the author says, on three books: Johnston's *American Politics*, Bryce's *American Politics* (*American Commonwealth*?), and Ford's *Rise and Growth of American Politics*. Excellent as these books are, they are themselves generalizations or condensations, and the reviewer is forced to the conclusion that the sources of the author's information were too limited for the ambitious scope of his volume. It would have been better to have attempted less and told more.

James A. Woodburn.

The Department of State of the United States: its History and Functions. By GAILLARD HUNT, Litt.D., LL.D. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. viii, 459.)

THOSE who hold that existing institutions can only be adequately understood through a knowledge of their evolution will find in this volume a complete historical explanation of the nature and functions of that institution called the Department of State.

In an almost painfully painstaking manner the author presents in detail all sorts of curious facts relating to the creation and development of this department. He discloses such interesting and little-known facts as for example that the department at various times has been charged with the incongruous duties of the mint, the census, patents, pardons, administration of territories, and correspondence with federal attorneys and marshals. He tells of the vicissitudes of the original copy of the Declaration of Independence on its perilous visit to Philadelphia to visit the Centennial Exposition. He gives the history of the Great Seal, and other similar matters. The suggestive fact is disclosed that the Secretary of State in the early days of the Confederation when that official was designated as the Secretary for Foreign Affairs was required to obtain permission from Congress to be absent from his post. All facts relating in any way to the history of the department are religiously recorded.

Those who do not hold that an historical approach to the study of an institution or organism contributes much to a clear understanding of its functions will perhaps be inclined to consider such a work as more or less of antiquarian significance, very much as the history of a charitable organization or a club. Such an undertaking is usually evidence of affectionate devotion, and it is apparent that Dr. Hunt in the course of his long and efficient service in the department became imbued with this spirit of devotion. The dedication of his book to Second Assistant Secretary Adee, who for so many years has likewise rendered brilliant service, contains eloquent evidence of this fact.

This book represents, as the author states in the preface, the result of a special task undertaken originally under the official instructions of the department in the form of sketches which were afterwards elaborated into pamphlets and an article for the *American Journal of International Law*. It was thus written to order to fill a recognized need. Fortunately it was written by a loyal and competent official of the department who could handle sympathetically material which would have proved uninteresting in other hands.

There can be no doubt as to the distinct value of this book in supplying accurate data respecting the actual organization and functions of the department. These data, however, lie widely scattered throughout the volume. Rulings in respect to the status of clerks, for example, are to be found in that portion of the work concerned principally with the

history of the department. In the latter part of the book, moreover, devoted to the actual organization and functions of the department, one finds included indiscriminately in a single chapter such unrelated subjects as the making of treaties, extradition, classification of correspondence, and the distribution of official duties. All such data would have been of much greater value if they had been arranged in the form of a manual for general reference, provided with numbered sections and a full index of the nature of a digest.

In spite of these criticisms the book has a decided value; first of all to historians and students of government; secondly, to all categories of officials whether within or without the Department of State; and thirdly, to the general public who may desire at any moment to ascertain the precise functions of that branch of the government, or to know the exact procedure to be followed in a given instance. The chapters on the Diplomatic and Consular Service, and on Passports and Authentications are of especial value, furnishing as they do authoritative data in the form of rules and regulations not easily to be found elsewhere. It is apparent however that such data are merely of temporary value as they are liable to be superseded at any time by fresh rules and regulations or by acts of Congress reorganizing the diplomatic and consular services.

The author announces his purpose in the preface "to show the formation and development of the Department of State and what its chief duties are and have been". His concern "has been with the machine of which the foreign service is a part and whose movements the Secretary of State directs". He has reasonably adhered to this purpose and may well rest satisfied with the thoroughness and accuracy with which he has fulfilled his task. A fairly complete index renders the book serviceable for needed reference within the limits indicated.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

Letters and Papers of John Singleton Copley and Henry Pelham, 1739–1776. [Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, vol. LXXI.] (Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society. 1914. Pp. xxii, 384.)

THIS notable collection of letters, which may be said to have been pulled out of the fire, for no one knows how or why these harmless private papers of two humble provincials ever got into the Public Record Office in London, is one of the most important of the many issues from the press of the venerable Massachusetts Historical Society, possessing as it does not only general historical interest but a very valuable material side not usual with such publications. It fixes points of great consequence that hitherto have been vexed and disputed as to the places where Copley painted and the authorship of many valuable portraits. The most significant of these disputed questions is as to whether Copley vis-

ited the Southern colonies, as has been claimed, and painted portraits there. The letters here printed negative the proposition in such a convincing way as to make it affirmatively certain that he did not. From this, numbers of Southern portraits attributed to Copley are forced to seek other paternity. Copley's only journey from Boston was in June, 1771, to New York, where he remained until the end of the year, and in these six months he painted thirty-seven portraits. He made one excursion from New York, going to Philadelphia (p. 163) Thursday, September 19, and reaching there Saturday *evening*, the 21st. To return he left Philadelphia Thursday *morning*, September 26, and got back to New York on Sunday, the 29th. I am particular in noting these dates in order to warn against the frequent looseness of statement in general correspondence that is not only confusing but what is more serious, misleading. For instance, in a letter from Copley to his brother Pelham, of November 6 (p. 174), in mentioning the amount of work he had done in New York, he speaks of "going to Philadelphia which took up 2 Weeks"; when we have seen he was away only ten days and in Philadelphia but four full ones. The importance of this is, that as all of his time was occupied socially and in studying the collections of paintings of Governor John Penn and of Messrs. Hamilton and Allen, he did not have time, in the four days he was there, to paint any portraits, as it has often been stated he did. And this brings me to an error in the note on page 301, where Copley mentions "Mr. Mifflins portrait and his Ladys". A note says, "Samuel and Rebecca Edgel Mifflin". The painting referred to by Copley was of Thomas Mifflin, afterward governor of Pennsylvania, and his wife Sarah Morris, now in the collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; the portraits of "Samuel and Rebecca Edgel Mifflin", attributed to Copley, were painted by Charles Willson Peale.

According to Allan Cunningham, presumably on the authority of Copley's son Lord Lyndhurst, the painter was born July 3, 1737, and this date has been followed in most of his biographies. But in a letter printed on page 48, dated September 12, 1766, Copley speaks of himself as of "the age of twenty-eight", to which there is a note, "This would show that he was born in 1738, and not in 1737, as usually stated. The Boston Records contain no entry of his birth or baptism." Consequently he was about ten years old when his half-brother Henry Pelham was born, February 14, 1748/9, and from Peter Pelham, who married Copley's mother, they must have both learned the rudimentary principles of painting, but knowing, as we do, the elder Pelham's meagre ability we know that he was but a broken reed to lean upon. Such being the case, the highly meritorious works that Copley produced in this country are all the more "wonderful", to use the adjective Sir Joshua Reynolds applied to "The Boy and Squirrel" (p. 41), when it was shown in London. It was plainly the self-development of his artistic consciousness that enabled him to paint the great portraits that he did before he

ever had been under foreign influence; indeed it was his feeling that his American paintings were his best works and a critical survey of his pictures painted here, before 1774, when he crossed the ocean, and his canvasses painted in Europe up to his death in 1815, show that his own estimate was the correct one.

The letters forming the latter half of the volume, from and to Copley and Pelham, many of them after Copley left Boston, are of extreme interest but my limits preclude me from more than mentioning them. It seems needless to say that typographically the book is all that the most fastidious can desire, and that the editorial work is of the first order, the letters having been printed with Chinese regard to exactness in orthography and expression. The only weak point is the index, which is sparse and wholly inadequate to point out the nuggets hidden in the text.

CHARLES HENRY HART.

The Letters of Richard Henry Lee. Collected and edited by JAMES CURTIS BALLAGH, Ph. D., LL.D., Associate Professor of Political Science in the University of Pennsylvania. [Published under the auspices of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America.] Volume II., 1779–1794. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxiii, 608.)

THIS second volume of Richard Henry Lee's letters, ably edited as was the earlier volume, does nothing to raise our estimation of him as a statesman. A very active political busybody, as he always proved himself, was sure to attain a certain lower middle-class reputation, somewhat enhanced in the popular mind because a favoring star made him the proposer of the resolution for Independence. These letters of the last fifteen years of his life, some 290 in number, reveal his views as a member, and one time president, of Congress, a Virginia legislator, and a senator from that state. Vain of his broad and statesmanlike mind, he was really narrow and sectional in a marked degree. His section, his state, his family were ever his chief concern.

The first 150 pages of these letters are almost wholly concerned with attacks on Silas Deane, whose published *Defense* against the charge of Arthur Lee, was denounced by Richard Henry Lee as an "infamous libel both against Congress and our family". He finds Deane "the most false and wicked Libeller that ever disgraced human nature", and accepts Arthur Lee's epithets, "Turbidus, inquietus, atrox", "his character too much of the Catilinarian cast". Lee's letters reveal in an amusing way the rising temperature of his wrath, as when he says that Deane hurt the United States more than 20,000 men, and a little later raises his estimate to 30,000 men, only to amend this with 40,000 men. We begin to look for eleven men in buckram. Lee hated Franklin because he had defended Deane. To Arthur Lee he writes hoping for

the former's escape out of "that wicked old man's power and influence", "the conscious guilt of that old man, and the wicked enmity he has practised and encouraged against you, must conspire to make him fear your arrival here, and instigate the fullest exertion of his art and malicious cunning supported by his present power to procure your detention in Europe". He would have had Franklin recalled from Paris, for he said: "I foresee abuse without end and injury extreme from his continuance. The vices that used to crowd about his heart in great abundance are no longer restrained by checks from the cautions of his head. It is the curse of man that the vicious part of his nature outlives his reason." Gouverneur Morris, because he took Deane's part, was denounced as "such a flutterer upon the surface". The mention of Gerard, the French minister, who had defended Deane, was sufficient to cause Lee to rend his raiment and throw dust upon his head. Lee could not tolerate opposition. He and his friends were always virtuous, but an opponent was little better than one of the wicked. Everybody was a Tory who was not in his faction of the revolutionary party. All of Deane's friends are written down Tories in Lee's letters. No fate was too dire for these "enemies of liberty". He even wonders why the sciatica does not attack the foes rather than the friends of America. He felt himself a martyr "persecuted by the united voice of Toryism, faction, envy, malice and all uncharitableness", but piously resigned himself to this martyrdom, "if I can only serve my country".

Only the record of his real services to his country can persuade one who reads his most sententious letters that he was not an historical Pecksniff, a self-deceiving demagogue. We weary of the cant phrases, "Honesty is the best policy", "Wickedness is ever more industrious than virtue", "Who fails in doing right fails nobly", and "An honest man is the noblest work of God". Lee is cynical about Congress, "where a man by being honest is sure to be oppressed", "where disgrace and ruin are the reward of the most faithful services", and the "discharge of duty raises up the angry and malignant passions". He was thoroughly saturated with the cant of his time about liberty, kings, and human rights. As long as there were kings there must be slaves, wherever there was restraint there was no liberty. He found "the Downfall of Great Britain, a dreadful example to wicked princes and people abandoned to luxury. A mighty empire quickly crumbled to dust—an empire that five years ago terrified the world and trampled under foot the rights of humanity and the principles of justice". "The ways of Heaven are as just as they are inscrutable." How the world hated England in the days when she abused her sea-power and had carried too far her menace of world-control, was well stated by Lee in 1780, and affords food for reflection to those who ponder on the attitude of the world to-day. "A once commercial nation, with her commerce nearly ruined, and under their accumulated pressures, not one ally, the powers of Europe viewing as with one eye, and approving as with one

mind, the downfall of a power that has been exercised with insult and oppression to almost every nation upon earth." One of Lee's letters also contains a suggestion for those who would meet the terrible might of modern armament with "armed citizenry". He controverted the proposal that Congress create a standing army for the defense of the frontier by the bland argument, "It would seem best to leave it to the people themselves, as hath ever been the case, and if at any time the frontier men should be hard pressed, they may be assisted by the midland militia. This will always secure to us a hardy set of men on the frontier used to arms, and ready to assist against invasions on other parts." "In this light the Indians may be considered as a useful people, as it is surely fortunate for a free community to be under some necessity of keeping the whole body acquainted with the use of arms." This is in keeping with his fanciful idea that it is better to secure loans from republics rather than monarchies.

Lee was always a weak-government man and nervous about encroachments upon the states. To Congress's request for a five per cent. duty, he objects that it is "too early and too strong an attempt to leap over these fences, established by the Confederation to secure the liberties of the respective states". Of one of the follies of weak-government men in that age he was not guilty, but perhaps his own sufferings had taught him that financial wisdom: "I am one who have the misfortune to see myself and family nearly ruined by the retrospective effect of our laws. Almost the whole of my landed estate was rented out some years before the war for low cash rents, and under the faith of existing law which secured me specie for my rents. The vast sums of paper money that have been issued (and this being now a legal tender for the discharge of rents growing from old contracts) and the consequent depreciation has well nigh effected an entire transfer of my estate to my tenants. This year, Sir, the rents of 4000 acres of fine land will not buy me 20 barrels of corn". In the editor's preface, he says that "Lee gives very different reasons from those sometimes assigned for his declining the proffered honor of representing his state in the Federal convention." Yes, he gives his health as an excuse, but he is not very plausible, and he reveals repeatedly his failure to appreciate the need of the convention, as when he writes Mason: "But, alas! Sir, I fear it is more in vicious manners, than mistakes in form [of government]that we must seek for the causes of this present discontent." "The human mind is too apt to rush from one extreme to another. . . . Whence this immense change of sentiment, in a few years? for now the cry is power, give Congress power, Without reflecting that every free nation, that hath ever existed, has lost its liberty by the same rash impatience, and want of necessary caution". True, Lee did grudgingly say, as the editor points out, that "This constitution has a great many excellent regulations in it, and if it could be reasonably amended would be a fine system", but he wanted "a new general Convention" to weave these amend-

ments "into the proffer'd system as that a Web may be produced fit for freemen to wear". After all it is no disgrace to have been a sincere weak-government man in those days, and why should the hero-worshippers of to-day strive as if to remove a stain from their hero?

C. H. Van Tyne.

The British Empire and the United States: a Review of their Relations during the Century of Peace following the Treaty of Ghent. By William Archibald Dunning, Lieber Professor of History and Political Philosophy, Columbia University. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. Pp. xl, 381.)

This book, occasioned by the anniversary of the treaty of Ghent, and accompanied by prefaces from the pens of James Bryce and Nicholas Murray Butler, is more interesting in its accidents than in its intent. Its summary of the diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the United States traverses ground already well known, and not illumined here by any special contributions. It is sound, readable, and reliable, but it is not in any sense new. Interwoven with the diplomatic topics, however, are paragraphs and sections stating the national backgrounds of both countries, and here we have the ripe *dicta* of a distinguished scholar. Whether we always agree with the *dicta*, or not, they are always interesting, and they lose nothing from being stated in terse epigram and pointed with acute intelligence.

The "hundred years of peace", as Professor Dunning summarizes them, divide into four periods, each having its own key. Between 1815 and 1835 it is British foreign policy; from 1836 to 1860 it is American growth; the next twenty-five years are determined by the Civil War; and since 1886 mutual expansion is the chief factor. Around these basic ideas the book is constructed. But, as the author says, "The discussion of international relations is almost invariably tainted with the fallacy of too sweeping generalization" (p. 357), and if Professor Dunning had held too closely to his scheme he would have failed to portray the fact. Diplomatic history is essentially episodal in its character, at best. When it is limited to two single participants over a long period, it becomes as a string of beads, with no necessary connection between the units except as a constant policy may provide it; and of constant policy the American State Department can make but a thin exhibit. The greatest weakness of the book is its attempt, dictated by its title, to reduce to a common denominator incommensurable facts. The episodes of a hundred years are after all chiefly episodes.

The connection between American democracy and British liberalism is frequently suggested throughout the book. The fact that the English Whigs have continued to regard themselves as closely allied with the more liberal factions in the United States is in part responsible for the success of Jackson in his British relations. Yet the connection must

not be driven too far, for the American democracy produced not only the Monroe Doctrine—"the pronunciamiento of a great democracy just arrived at aggressive self-consciousness" (p. 54)—but also a tendency to bait the British lion with Canada and Fenianism and Irish Home Rule. And the British Liberals produced Palmerston and a type of jingo diplomacy that brought war dangerously near in the cases of McLeod and the Maine boundary, the *Trent*, and the *Alabama*. We may rejoice with the author that Polk and Palmerston did not synchronize. It is true that among the people British Liberals and Americans have fraternized sympathetically and without obstruction, but in neither country have these classes found a sure means of impressing their hopes upon politicians, even of their own faith, when in executive office.

In the *dicta* of Professor Dunning's book the historian will have the greatest interest. It may perhaps be doubted whether steam navigation had by 1830 made enough advance to give great stimulus to American inland trade (p. 77); or whether, after the Venezuela episode, "militant Americanism receded into the depths and, stronger and more self-confident for having been revealed in its full proportions, awaited a more propitious season for asserting itself" (p. 312); or whether "every nerve of the nation tingled with joy" (p. 321) at the Spanish War. The American case for the Alaska strip appears to be understated (p. 327). And it is interesting to note that the list of "singularly sane and gifted" (p. 329) personalities who controlled foreign affairs in the first decade of this century includes Hay, Choate, and Root, and Salisbury, Lansdowne, Grey, Pauncefote, and Bryce, but makes no mention of Theodore Roosevelt.

Frederic L. Paxson.

The Whig Party in the South. By Arthur Charles Cole, Ph.D., Instructor in History in the University of Illinois. (Washington: American Historical Association; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press. 1913. Pp. xii, 392.)

The history of the great political parties in the United States is not quite the history of the country, but it is an important part of that history. The story, therefore, of the Whig party in the South cannot fail to command a welcome. And the history of the Whig party is particularly desirable in clear, succinct form since the Southern Whigs formed a sort of social group, unlike their Northern allies and still more unlike the Southern Democrats.

Before describing in detail this important book, it may be well to note that the author has used manuscript materials of very great interest and importance, hitherto little known to scholars. The Mangum correspondence in the possession of Dr. Stephen B. Weeks, the Floyd, Fillmore, and Duff Green papers are the more important of these, though the various citations from the Library of Congress treasures

show unfamiliar traits of several leaders of that stirring time. Of scarcely less importance in the make-up of these chapters have been the numberless volumes of published correspondence—such as the *Letters of Zachary Taylor from the Battlefields of the Mexican War,* the *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman,* and the *Memoir of Sargent S. Prentiss,* seldom cited by historians of the period.

The book itself covers the period of 1830–1861 and in its leading chapters: the Rise of the Whig Party, Growth of Unity, the Slavery Question to 1848, the Union Movement of 1850–1851, and the Election of 1852 it traces the story of the party and of Henry Clay in a most satisfactory and scholarly manner. It is to a large extent the political history of the South between the advent of Jackson and the death of Clay, or while the South was "finding herself" and making ready for the domination of the country which followed the election of Pierce. Still Mr. Cole is careful not to steer too far afield when he touches the general narrative or the fascinating biography of some of the leading Whigs. There is poise and certainty of touch about the book which marks its writer as a sound and discriminating scholar.

Although such a student does not readily pronounce judgments upon men and issues, the reader cannot fail to understand better than heretofore the leading men of the Whig party and the party itself. These men were no democrats and they were honest enough to be chary of declaring themselves willing always to trust the people. They did not trust the people and the party was a party, like the Episcopalian Church of the South, which it was said all gentlemen would choose for their own. They did not openly renounce the teachings of Jefferson, but they did quite honestly declare that the people were not capable of complete self-government.

Much as one may regret to say so, the career of Henry Clay appears in worse light than it has hitherto been allowed to appear. That charming leader and ambitious man certainly did not act on his bold claim that he would rather be right than president. In fact it now begins to appear that he would have surrendered any conviction that he ever entertained in order to be president. In the combination with Calhoun in order to defeat Jackson's Force Bill, in the surrender of his opinions on bank and tariff in order to drive Van Buren from power, and at many other turns in that eventful career, Clay seems to merit a harsher judgment than Schurz or even the greater historians have expressed. But if Clay longed for high office he was not alone in his longing, as this work makes plain enough.

It ought to be stated in conclusion that this book does not enter into the difficult field of social and political philosophy, nor does it treat to any considerable extent the economic background of men like Clay, the Prestons, Stephens, John Bell, or the Northern men who went South to become ardent pro-slavery champions. There is a series of most valuable maps in the appendix which cost endless pains and which give every evidence of being accurate. WILLIAM E. DODD.

The Life of Reverdy Johnson. By Bernard C. Steiner, Ph.D., LL.B. (Baltimore: The Norman, Remington Company. 1914. Pp. v, 284.)

Reverdy Johnson was a distinguished American lawyer (1796–1876). He was descended from an ancestry of lawyers. He followed William Wirt at the Maryland bar, and took rank with these distinguished men in learning and ability. In his earlier days he was intimately associated with Roger B. Taney in the Maryland practice and later argued many important cases in the high court over which Taney presided. At the time of his death the general assembly of Maryland spoke of Johnson as "the foremost jurist of America", and great lawyers like Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, recognized in him one of the acknowledged leaders of the American legal fraternity. He was interested in politics and government; was a United States senator from 1845 to 1849; was Attorney-General of the United States under President Taylor; was a Maryland Union man and again a United States senator during the Civil War, wielding a large influence in keeping Maryland true to the Union; while in the Senate he was a moderate conservative of commanding influence in the era of Reconstruction, supporting the "Restoration theory" and President Johnson's plan of Reconstruction, and doing as much as any man to save President Johnson from conviction on impeachment; and he was for a short time under Johnson the minister of the United States to Great Britain.

This life of the lawyer and public servant, Dr. Steiner sets forth in a useful and well-balanced biography. The work is an elaboration of a sketch written for the series of volumes edited by Professor William Draper Lewis entitled *Great American Lawyers.* Its pages are not scintillating with human interest because Johnson's public utterances were usually dignified and stately, measured and learned, usually legal and constitutional in character, and they were not much marked with exciting incidents or dramatic style. But what may be lacking in vivid attraction is made up by solid worth in a biography that is very informing on the life of its subject and on an important period in American history. Dr. Steiner devotes a chapter to interesting incidents in the life of Johnson at the bar. In politics he shows Johnson as a pronounced conservative, a "peace" man who sought to avoid and restrain everything of an "ultra" nature. In his early Maryland life as state senator, he was a Jeffersonian Republican but later he became a Whig from principles of broad construction. In the forties he was repeatedly a delegate to Whig national conventions and Dr. Steiner's extracts from letters and reminiscences throw indicative side-lights on these campaigns and elections. Johnson favored the Mexican War but though personally an anti-slavery man, he opposed the Wilmot Proviso on constitutional grounds. He was always a stout defender of the "constitution" against innovation and change, and appeared always ready to permit

the slavery question to be settled by decisions of the Supreme Court. His influence is said to have induced Taney to give the noted political opinion in the Dred Scott Case. After the break-up of the Whig party in 1854, Johnson became a Democrat, following the fortunes of Douglas and popular sovereignty in 1860. He sought some means of compromise and peace at the break-up of the Union, but became a conservative advocate of the war. He opposed Lincoln's re-election in 1864 and was frequently a severe critic of the War President. In Reconstruction, Johnson steadily opposed the Congressional policy. He opposed the Freedmen's Bureau Bill and the Civil Rights Bill. He held that a person of African descent could not be a citizen under the Dred Scott decision, which he held to be good law; and he contended that short of an amendment to the Constitution, Federal citizenship could come only through the states—the states alone could say what persons shall be citizens.

The author traces with accurate care the conservative course of Johnson in the Senate, on all matters of public interest, showing him to be a consistent member of the opposition, opposing the Republican majority on all matters of historic moment. His record is carefully set forth not only on such notable matters as have been cited but on many matters of minor concern. Johnson's course was somewhat harassing to the radical anti-slavery leaders. He opposed the "iron-clad" oath, the emancipation of the slaves without compensation to loyal owners, and he championed General Wade Hampton's controversy with General Sherman as to the responsibility for the burning of Columbia. These are only a few instances of many interesting phases of Johnson's public career as set forth in Dr. Steiner's volume.

Johnson's career was well worthy of this valuable biography, which the student of the middle period of the nineteenth century will find to be full of suggestive material.

James A. Woodburn.

The Life of Thomas Brackett Reed. By Samuel W. McCall. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xiii, 303.)

The choice of Mr. McCall to write the official and probably the final biography of Thomas B. Reed, was a happy one. Few men as competent as the author to undertake the task possess so many qualifications for it as he. He had a long personal friendship with the man, was thoroughly familiar, by being a part of it, with the scene of Reed's contests and victories, and had the rare and peculiar merit of continuous political sympathy with him to the end, even in that final crisis when they dissented strongly from that policy of the party to which they both belonged known as "imperialism". Moreover he had access to the many family papers, and to fragmentary diaries, letters, and other literary remains that were never published. It is a pity that Mr. McCall

did not follow the custom common in England, of sending widespread a notice that he was engaged upon this biography, and soliciting letters and reminiscences worthy of preservation. There are undoubtedly hundreds of men still living, associated with Reed in public life, who could have supplied material that should not have been overlooked in the preparation of the authorized and final biography of such a man.

That is not a condemnatory criticism of this book, which is a good book, but an expression of regret that it was not made better and fuller than it is. Aside from Reed's masterful conduct in a position of great power and responsibility, and his unswerving adherence to the principle which for the time seemed to him the only right principle, that which most fascinated and attracted all men who watched his career was his facility with tongue and pen—his faculty in saying or writing, on the spur of the moment, phrases so terse, so apt, so striking, that they are unforgettable. Uttered though they might be on the most serious public occasions, and with the most earnest purpose, having nothing of frivolity or flippancy or lack of dignity, they yet have on the mind of the reader to-day, as they had at the time they were launched, all the effect of pure wit. Mr. McCall has perpetuated many of such sayings and phrases. But Reed was versatile in his characterization of men and measures, and in his sarcasms, and one regrets that the specimens given are not twice as numerous as they are. One misses, for example—perhaps Mr. McCall purposely left it out, in consideration for the feelings of others—that masterpiece, delivered in love and sorrow of one who failed him at a critical moment, "Joe, God hates a quitter."

The author has presented an accurate portrayal of his subject, has made the narrative of his life and activities clear, and has introduced many an interesting passage of political history of the time to illuminate and explain Reed's course of action. It is an eminently readable and enjoyable book. There may well be two opinions whether the author should not have emphasized more strongly than he has done, the immense and permanent service Reed rendered to the country when he was Speaker, and whether he should not have entered more fully into the reasons why Reed, the ablest and strongest man in his party, was passed by in the selection of a candidate for the highest office in its gift.

Reed was, as his opponents declared, a "czar". As Speaker he dominated the House of Representatives. He led his party; he enabled it to carry out its policy—when he approved that policy—in spite of a filibustering opposition; he successfully curbed it and refused to allow any measure, though backed by Republicans, to come to a vote when he deemed that measure injurious to the country; and when he found, as he declared, that the House had ceased to be "a deliberative body", alone, and by his self-assumed autocratic power, he amended the century-old practice of the House as to the presence of a quorum. The last-named act remains as a permanent monument to his memory, a

restoration of efficiency to the popular legislative body. Now that time has passed there are few who will not admit that his decisions as to the measures he would, and those he would not permit to pass were dictated by far-seeing wisdom. But the czardom which he established has been abolished. The dynasty could survive only so long as the throne was occupied by men as strong, as wise, as high-minded as he was. His successors possessed some one, some another, of his qualifications to rule. Not one of them possessed them all. The House rose in its might and its wrath, and wrested the dictatorship from its Speakers.

It is true of Reed, as it has been true of many another public man, that his strength was his weakness. His power as a leader, whether of a majority or a minority, enabled him to thwart, and his integrity and the loftiness of his principles compelled him to thwart, many dubious schemes; and thus he made enemies. His impatience with whatever was pretentious and superficial led him into needlessly uttered expressions of contempt that rankled in the minds of the little men at whom they were aimed. He was ambitious, but as a politician he was not tactful, and would not budge from a position once taken with deliberation, though his inflexibility might, and he was aware of it, imperil his political life. But the country was full of admirers of "Tom Reed", and they admire him still; yet many of those who admired him and were not his enemies doubted the wisdom of placing at the head of affairs one who had such unbounded confidence in his own judgment or opinion, and who was so capable of making his opinions effective. What would have happened if Thomas B. Reed had been in the presidential chair when press and people and Congress demanded that war should be declared against Spain?

EDWARD STANWOOD.

MINOR NOTICES

A Theory of Civilisation. By Sholto O. G. Douglas. (New York, the Macmillan Company, 114, pp. 246.) This book attempts to prove, more or less in terms of evolutionary doctrine, that religious faith is the fundamental cause of civilized progress, and that religious faith is itself a "psychic illusion". After a general introduction (pp. 7–27) defining his theory, the author in part I. (pp. 31–154) applies his ideas to the "Olympian illusion" and the "Christian illusion", and in part II. (pp. 157–236) devotes successive chapters to Ancient Egypt, Buddhism, Islam, Confucianism, and Ancient Mexico and Peru; and in a final chapter (pp. 237–246) he seeks to forecast the nature and direction of the "illusion" of the future.

The discussion shows considerable reading and a fair degree of insight, together with a certain cleverness of thought and statement. But the book cannot be regarded as a contribution of much value to historical learning. The materials massed together in the several chapters

are not sufficient to sustain the author's thesis that an irrational religious faith is the efficient cause of civilization. They hardly do more than make evident the already generally recognized significance of the religious factor in history. The argument of the book abounds in speculations and assumptions fatal to the cogency of its thought. Seldom are its expositions noteworthy for depth or interpretative worth. Now and then (as on page 200) the author recognizes the presence of other forces than "psychic illusion" in history, but for the book as a whole no such recognition is discernible in an adequate way.

Worst of all, in his contention that, while religious faith is the cause of historical progress, yet religious faith is itself a "psychic illusion", the author seeks to maintain the position that civilization is rooted in unreality, in that which is untrue and illusory—a result sufficiently novel and startling. For this writer, the irrationality of religion makes it the constructive force in history. He speaks of "the decline of faith as a loss of those illusions which are the essential cause of civilisation" (p. 93); he affirms that "only a new illusion could lead mankind to a new civilisation" (p. 115); at the end he summarizes his results in the statement that "our civilisation is the result of the religion that preceded it or synchronised with its earlier stages, just as we have seen that previous civilisations in Europe resulted from previous forms of psychic illusion" (p. 237). Such utterances are typical.

The present work adds one more to the well-intentioned attempts to find some single explanation of historical progress. It is suggestive but not convincing.

Arley B. Show.

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Third series, volume VIII. (London, the Society, 1914, pp. vii, 233.) This volume, more than its predecessors, is devoted to the consideration of historical materials. Professor Firth's presidential address is a plea for "a more systematic treatment of the materials for British history; and in order to effect that, for a survey of the whole field by a committee of historical scholars representing various subjects and various periods". Like the reports of Dutch and American historians issued in the last decade, this survey should indicate the gaps to be filled by future publications. As a contribution to the execution of this project Professor Firth examines a portion of the field of English history in the seventeenth century and points out some things that ought to be done therein. Later contributors to the proposed survey will be aided by the forthcoming *Bibliography of Modern British History,* whose scope, plan, and progress are described in a paper by Henry R. Tedder. Professor A. F. Pollard discusses "The Authenticity of the 'Lords' Journals' in the Sixteenth Century", indicating many defects in existing editions of Parliamentary records. By comparing the printed journals with the extant manuscripts at the House of Lords, and with Bowyer's and D'Ewes's

transcripts, he seems to prove that the gaps in the journals of 1559 did not exist until between 1630 and 1682, and are due to the disappearance of leaves from the original manuscript He explains the statement made in 1682 that "the original Journal books are not now extant", by a confusion between the clerks' rough notes and the official journals, or by the fact that "for the sixteenth century there were no Journals extant which came up to late seventeenth-century criteria of what was original and official". In a short paper on "Prégent de Bidoux's Raid in Sussex in 1514 and the Cotton MS. Augustus I (i), 18", Alfred Anscombe reviews the conclusions regarding this manuscript reached by Dr. Gairdner in a paper read before the Royal Historical Society in 1906, and suggests a different interpretation. Still more briefly R. C. Fowler calls attention to a class of documents, arranged at the Public Record Office recently, known as "Significations of Excommunication", which "form almost our only knowledge of the practical working of the system". In the longest contribution to the volume (40 pp.) F. J. Routledge supplies a guide to "Manuscripts at Oxford relating to the Later Tudors, 1547–1603". He describes the contents of these manuscripts, and indicates which have been printed. An interesting paper on "Mounted Infantry in Medieval Warfare" by Dr. J. E. Morris traces the gradual substitution of light for heavy cavalry, by the English, after the battle of Bannockburn. Heavy infantry also lost favor and the horse-archer, "the finest fighting man of the middle ages", made his appearance by 1337. Under the title "John Wycliffe, the Reformer, and Canterbury Hall, Oxford", the Rev. H. S. Cronin deals with "the history of the contest between the regulars and seculars for the possession of Canterbury Hall, Oxford", and adduces evidence for the identity of the Reformer with the warden of the Hall.

F. G. D.

A Guide to the Study of Church History. By W. J. McGlothlin, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville. (New York, George H. Doran Company, 1914, pp. 359.) The first edition appeared in 1908. Although little more than an extended index to four popular manuals on church history—Newman, Baptist; Hurst, Methodist; Kurtz, Lutheran; Alzog, Roman Catholic—its summaries are suggestive. There are no references to important works on special topics, and very few references to sources, except occasionally to Henderson's *Documents*, while recent collections are unnoticed. The bibliography contains only ten titles. There is a fair index and an appendix containing names and dates of popes and rulers of all countries except the United States, and an outline of the Christian Year.

The history is divided into five periods, with subdivisions, six topics under each: Missions, Government, Worship, Theology, Life and Literature, introduced by a brief outline of the political history.

It is a fair recapitulation of the important facts, including Eastern Christianity. There are several inaccuracies and omissions, only a few of which can be noted. The author overlooks the evidences of a distinct clerical order and the beginnings of a fixed liturgy in the first century. Carlovingian is used for Carolingian. Of England in the Norman period, we are told: "Feudalism had not risen there"; a very inadequate statement. Lay Investiture should be included with Simony and Marriage of the Clergy (here called Concubinage, a too harsh and misleading term). Mention is made of "the Investiture strife in Germany, France and England (Anselm)", but without reference to its settlement in England fifteen years before the Concordat of Worms. In the outline of the English Reformation no notice is taken of the important beginnings of liturgical reform in the later years of Henry VIII. The treatment of the modern period is more valuable, especially the brief characterization of the modern churches; though we read: "Protestant Episcopal Church now has over 500,000 communicants"; really there are over twice that number. The table of contents is defective, and there are several inaccuracies in the appendix. The repetition of the title of the book on every page is unnecessary. The heading of the chapter or period would be more helpful. All publishers should note this.

The book would be useful in an elementary course but seems quite inadequate for theological students.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

The Governors and Judges of Egypt or Kitâb el' Umarâ' (el Wulâh) wa Kitâb el Quḍâh of El Kindî together with an Appendix derived mostly from Raf' el Iṣr by Ibn Hajar. Edited by Rhuvon Guest. [Printed by the Trustees of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial", vol. XIX.] (Leyden, E. J. Brill, London, Luzac and Company, 1912, pp. viii, 84, 686.) In this volume, containing as it does two histories by El Kindî and a considerable amount of supplementary matter, we have historical material dealing with two parts of the Moslem administration of Egypt from the beginning of that administration on for a period of nearly four hundred years. The point of view of El Kindî's two histories is indicated by their respective titles, the former being devoted to the governors and "constables", and the latter to the judges. The editor brings out clearly (*cf.* introduction, pp. 10–13) that both books have the same general arrangement and that in each the author sticks closely to his subject. Perhaps it will be sufficient to quote the editor regarding the second book:

The book, like El Wulâh, keeps closely to its subject. It treats the Qâḍis in chronological order, giving the dates of their appointment, and generally adding personal details and anecdotes relating to them. Besides, it includes a number of their pronouncements in cases presenting some peculiar feature, and in a few instances the cases are stated at some length. Other cases are given which were referred to and decided by the Khalif. There is much to be learned from it with regard

to the development of the Arabs under the influence of town life, the growth of certain institutions, and the evolution of Muhammadan law. It is unfortunate that the text is often so corrupt that its restoration has to depend on conjecture or that it has to be left obscure.

For details as to the unique manuscript on which this edition of El Kindî's histories is based, for a list of the rest of the author's works as well as for a statement of such particulars as are known regarding his life, and for other details the reader must be referred to the introduction. The editor has evidently put a great deal of work into this introduction, and it will repay careful study. Special attention may be called to the editor's analysis and tabulation of the principal authorities for the two histories.

The glossary, the reproduction in facsimile of six pages of the original manuscript, and the maps add both interest and value to the volume.

The Arabic text was printed in Beirût by the Jesuit Fathers and presents a very pleasing appearance. As giving some indication of the number of names occurring in the work it may be of interest to call attention to the fact that the Arabic index of proper names occupies sixty-eight pages. The volume is a handsome one and both the editor and the Gibb Trustees deserve the thanks of scholars for its publication.

J. R. Jewett.

Maritime Enterprise, 1485–1558. By James A. Williamson. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913, pp. 416.) The maritime and commercial history of the first half of the Tudor period has suffered because of the natural importance given to Elizabeth's reign. But the student who fails to appreciate the significance of Henrician foundations or who is blinded by the date 1509 can scarcely understand economic events in the reign of Edward and Mary. Still less can he fairly judge the administrative machinery of the latter half of the sixteenth century and its personal and material relation to the spirit, desires, and policies which had gained vigor since the dynastic wars. As a tribute to such problems many chapters in this volume are most welcome. But it is a collection of essays of somewhat unequal value rather than a well-knit survey of the period as a whole. In general the plan followed throughout is that of a few chapters here and there on royal policy or commercial regulation and then treatment of achievement on foreign waters in selected geographical fields. The exceptions to this method are a chapter on the fall of the Hansa in England and the concluding reviews of "Ships and Men" and "The Navy, 1485–1558". The material used is indicated by fairly frequent references to the well-known printed collections and in somewhat uneven fashion to additional manuscript sources. Naturally at given places Schanz and Oppenheim figure to a considerable extent. The index is serviceable; and in particular the numerous reproductions of early drawings and maps are excellent and valuable.

Such a method inevitably calls attention to several disappointments. Thus, fisheries and ports, though the latter is a subtitle in the table of contents, are not adequately treated; the author's researches on the Mediterranean have not added much to Hakluyt and the usual gap, 1502–1509, in English maritime history is still unbridged. Indeed, with the exception of the Spanish and Venetian calendars the investigations are based almost entirely on domestic materials. Nevertheless useful summaries of such documents have been made in many cases and notably in the review of the causes leading to the failure of the Hansa in England. The fifty pages on the Cabot voyages support the belief in three voyages of which the last was by Sebastian, who thus initiated the search for the North-West passage. Perhaps the strongest claim to a constructive thesis lies in the frequent endeavors to connect commercial and political policies; and here are found many suggestive comments which should incite further investigation. Lastly is a greater appreciation of the importance of foreign policy in its influence on domestic economic legislation. As a whole therefore the book is admirable for the use of the undergraduate and often stimulating to the older and more critical student.

A. L. P. D.

Willem Janszoon Blaeu, 1571–1638: a Sketch of his Life and Work, with an especial Reference to his large World Map of 1605: Facsimile of the unique Copy belonging to the Hispanic Society of America: eighteen Sheets with Key Plate. By Edward Luther Stevenson, Ph.D. [Publications of the Hispanic Society of America, no. 85.] (New York, the Hispanic Society, 1914, text, pp. 67, atlas, 19 plates.) Both atlas and text are things of beauty. As a frontispiece the text has a handsome portrait of Blaeu, and it is illustrated with sundry facsimiles besides. Mr. Stevenson's biography rests on that of Baudet, and devotes itself to Blaeu's work as a cartographer and globe-maker. It is followed by a special study on the World Map now reproduced. This map, an engraved one mounted on coarse linen and attached to a rough wooden frame, now hangs safely on the walls of the Hispanic Society's museum: but it has so suffered at the hands of time that the date of its copyright by the Dutch States General has been worn away and the year of its issue is inferred only from the dedication of this copy to King Henry IV. of France and from a resolution of the Estates of Holland, April 26, 1605, awarding to Blaeu a gratuity for such a world map. It is a pity that the inscription to King Henry, which is merely pasted on this copy, could not be removed to reveal the earlier one printed beneath it.

As Mr. Stevenson reminds us, "in a map of this character one may say the particular scientific and historical value lies in the latest records it contains relative to exploration and discovery", and happily the inserted notes as to explorers and the coasts of the newly discovered lands have suffered less than has much of the map from the flaking off of the

paper. Less fortunate are the marginal vignettes of towns (among them "Mexico" and "Cusco") and of race types. Enough is left to show the superb execution of the map; and, after all, such maps are of less value to the history of geography than to that of cartography. Nobody who has had seriously to study the successive publications of these closet geographers but has learned to his cost with what an absurd absence of criticism each copies everything to be found in its predecessors, no matter how the same cape, river, town, may with the same or varying spelling appear in differing places on the same map. The two Amazons which long appeared on every map are only the most glaring case. Mr. Stevenson himself points out how scandalously the present map was plundered by that of Hondius which he reproduced a half-dozen years ago and how Blaeu appealed to the Estates of Holland against such thefts. But Blaeu himself, too, took his goods where he could find them.

Mr. Stevenson's attempts at the decipherment of the map's letter-press are not always happy—or else the proof-reader has done him an ill turn. To his text he appends a bibliography of the literature on Blaeu and a list of his geographical publications.

G. L. B.

The Naval Tracts of Sir William Monson. Edited with a Commentary drawn from the State Papers and other Original Sources by M. Oppenheim. Volume V. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. XLVII.] (London, the Navy Records Society, 1914, pp. xii, 370.) With the appearance of the fifth volume of Sir William Monson's *Naval Tracts* that work visibly approaches completion; and it is a circumstance of at least curious interest that the publication of the first considerable English work on naval strategy should coincide with one of the greatest periods in which that strategy played its part in the affairs of the world. The present volume lacks none of the qualities which make Monson's work worth reprinting and, still more, worth reading. Of all the entertaining prefaces and introductions which introduce his various "books" probably the most amusing is the "Epistle to the Projectors of this Age" to which "the name 'promoter' were more proper as fitter to be loathed than cherished". If one wishes to understand why Monson's work was so long hidden in royal closets and naval archives, he need but consider the subtitles of the present volume, "A Project to make War upon Holland", or Spain, or France, as the case may be, of whose value the very pains taken to keep the manuscript concealed bears eloquent witness. The description not alone of naval combinations, but of harbors and resources of England's possible enemies, of how to "have footing" in India, to attain Guinea, or to discover Timbuctoo or Gogo evidence not merely wide knowledge and strategic capacity, but a breadth of view as to English naval and commercial dominion of true Elizabethan scope. And when

to these one adds his chapters on "Stratagems at Sea"; "An Anglo-Dutch Alliance", the "Advantage of the Offensive", one comes almost into a modern atmosphere. Yet to the average reader, if such there be, the better part is still to be found in those chapters on "Whales, Mermaids and Maelstroms", the stories of the Moor and of Manoel Fernandez, the "Personal Adventures", and those amusing headings relating to the fisheries and the Dutch, of "usurers and the Devil", the Dutch as "panthers", "Hecuba" as "vermin" and as a deadly "serpent". These speak neither the Elizabethan nor the modern but the true spirit of the seventeenth-century English seaman.

W. C. A.

The Legislative Union of England and Scotland. The Ford Lectures delivered in Hilary Term, 1914, by P. Hume Brown, M.A., LL.D., Fraser Professor of Ancient (Scottish) History and Palaeography, University of Edinburgh, Historiographer-Royal for Scotland. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914, pp. xii, 208.) In view of the new materials which have recently become available—notably the *Papers of the Earl of Mar and Kellie,* published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in 1904, the *Seafield Correspondence from 1685 to 1708,* edited for the Scottish History Society in 1912, and the *Intimate Society Letters of the Eighteenth Century,* in 1910—Professor P. Hume Brown was amply justified in selecting for his Ford Lectures the subject of *The Legislative Union of England and Scotland,* especially since he has supplemented his study of these printed documents by a careful investigation of much unprinted material in the British Museum and the Public Record Office, London, selections from which he has given us in an appendix, occupying about one-third of his volume. On the other hand, it is curious that he absolutely ignores the existence of three excellent works dealing with the same subject which have appeared during the last twenty years, namely, Mackinnon's *Union of England and Scotland* (1896), Mathieson's *Scotland and the Union* (1905), and Miss Keith's *Commercial Relations of England and Scotland* (1910), the two latter of which were noticed in the American Historical Review, XI. 892–894, and XVI. 665.

However, the six lectures furnish a lucid sketch of the political and religious parties at the time of the Union, they explain clearly the complicated motives of the men engaged and make various phases of the event clearer than ever before; for example, how the difficulty over the Alien Act of 1705 was adjusted; and how the natural hostility of the mass of the Scots toward the Union was accentuated by the delay in paying and distributing the Equivalent, by continued vexations in trade regulations, and by the injustice of the Malt Tax.

A. L. C.

The Diary of Adam Tas (1705–1706). Edited by Leo Fouché, B.A., Ph. et Litt.D., Professor of History, Transvaal University College, Pretoria. English Translation by A. C. Paterson, M.A., Professor of Latin, Transvaal University College. (London, New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1914, pp. xlvii, 367.) This diary, covering a portion of the years 1705–1706, was kept by Adam Tas, a Dutchman, who, in 1697, went to the Cape as a "free burgher" or colonist. In addition to furnishing an intimate and graphic picture of the daily life of the Cape farmers at the beginning of the eighteenth century, it throws vivid if broken flashes of light on a struggle—in which Adam Tas was a leading spirit—between the burghers and Governor Willem Adriaan van der Stel. The point at issue in this conflict, as significant as it was bitter, is carefully set forth in an appendix double the length of the printed text of the diary. The colonists had been brought to the Cape to furnish grain, meat, and other supplies for the fleets and garrisons of the Dutch East India Company. Badly enough off from the fact that the company's monopoly of their output almost absolutely restricted their market, they were brought to the verge of ruin and goaded to revolt when Governor van der Stel, his father, his brother, and half a dozen of his creatures, proceeded to enter the business of farming and cattle-raising and to appropriate the lion's share of the already limited market. The revolt was successful and the governor was recalled. Recently Leibrandt, Calvin, and Edgar in opposition to the historian Theal have sought to rehabilitate him; but Professor Fouché in an admirably constructed piece of historical criticism, supported by ample citations from the sources, effectually demolishes their arguments.

The diary and the discussion are printed in Dutch on one side of the page with a translation on the opposite side by Professor Paterson. He seems in general to have rendered Tas's robust and picturesque style with fidelity and spirit, though he strains a bit too much after the archaic, for example, in translating *en Thee gedronken* (p. 71) "drank a dish of tea", and *wij . . . gezonden waaren* (p. 339) "we was sent". The renderings *eenige menschen* (p. 67) as "certain parties" and *preekmaker* (p. 71) as "man of sermons" do not commend themselves to the reviewer.

A. L. C.

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second. By Lord Macaulay. Edited by Charles Harding Firth, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, University of Oxford. Volume IV. (London, Macmillan and Company, 1914, pp. xx, 1533–2082.) With the publication of the fourth volume of the new Macaulay the limits of the edition are fully defined. The present installment begins with chapter XIII.—the Revolution in Scotland—and ends with chapter XVII.—the capitulation of Limerick and the close of the war in Ireland in 1691. The division into volumes, it is interesting to note, is far from corre-

sponding with that of the original and standard editions which appeared before 1860. Of those the first two volumes contained five chapters each, the next two six chapters each, the fifth volume but three chapters. In the present edition the first three volumes contain four chapters each, the fourth five chapters. Besides, as has been noted earlier, the pages of this edition are numbered continuously, so that we have now arrived at page 2082. It is, therefore, impossible to collate any references in the present form with corresponding passages in the editions generally used. Moreover the consecutive numbering by no means obviates this difficulty. There should certainly appear on the outside of the volume or on the title-page, under such a system, another notation, preferably that of pages or at least chapters, to aid in identifying the contents of each volume. It is obviously impossible, without such a device, to determine in what volume a given page or chapter is to be found. Another, if minor, point may be noted as appealing particularly to reviewers. The publishers, following a usage sometimes observed among their kind in England, have taken pains to permanently disfigure the title-pages with a perforated announcement that this is a complimentary copy. This may serve some useful purpose, but its polite phrasing scarcely compensates for the damage done the book.

So far as the contents of the present volume go, they follow closely the model of the other three. Seven plates in color, and nearly a hundred and fifty illustrations in black and white, amply illuminate the text. The proportion of portraits to other subjects of reproduction remains essentially the same. Medals and maps, contemporary broadsides and views, with woodcuts, caricatures, and drawings, form an extraordinarily interesting gallery. The colored frontispiece of Dundee, and Dahl's portrait of the young Duchess of Marlborough are exceptionally good; and it is interesting to observe among the plates a reproduction of a water-color sketch of the Pass of Killiecrankie, an unusual and not unpleasing feature in the development of historical illustration.

W. C. Abbott.

Intervention and Colonization in Africa. By Norman Dwight Harris, Professor of European Diplomatic History, Northwestern University. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xviii, 384.) This is the first of two volumes on "European expansion and world politics" to be published under the general title of *World Diplomacy*. As the one is devoted to "intervention and colonization in Africa", so the other will consider "intervention and competition in Asia". "The expansion of nations in recent years", declares the author in his preface, "has been an attempt of the European states to secure territory and economic concessions, in order that they may provide adequately for the future development of their respective countries, and that they may maintain their present prominent positions in the family of nations." His purpose in writing the book is "to trace, chiefly from

official sources, the origin and development of this movement in its main features during the past forty years". The illusion of the title is great, but the realities of the preface dispel it.

A chapter of eighteen pages on European Expansion and World Politics introduces the reader to the subject proper. This is presented in an order of narration at once chronological, geographical, topical, logical, ethnic, and otherwise. Two chapters given over to a description of the founding of the Congo Independent State and its annexation by Belgium are followed by five bearing the captions German Colonization in Southwest Africa, British and German East Africa, and Uganda, French Colonial Expansion in West Africa, the Sudan and the Sahara, Nigerian Enterprise, and South African Expansion and Union. The six remaining deal with the Reoccupation of Northern Africa under subheadings that comprehend Algeria, Oran, Constantine, Tunisia, Morocco, Tripolitania, Egypt, and the Sudan. Of the fourteen chapters the one on Nigeria is decidedly the best. Three appendixes furnish a Topical Bibliography of Secondary Sources, which is quite different in its arrangement from that of the book itself, a Summary of Territories (in Africa) held or controlled by European States in May, 1914, and a table of Revenues and Expenditures, Imports and Exports, 1887 and 1912. Several useful maps, also, are supplied.

As the reviewer made his way through the book his mind became a succession of question marks. He wondered, for example, to whom the work was addressed. Nearly two-thirds of the pages are bare of reference, and yet the diction reminds one too much of blue and yellow books with an occasional *Weiss Buch,* to suggest a popular appeal. Oddly enough no allusion is made anywhere to Hertslet's *Map of Africa by Treaty.* Although German, Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian activities are discussed, references in German are conspicuously scarce and the three Latin tongues are altogether silent. What is "intervention" in Africa, furthermore, what is "world diplomacy", and what previous European occupation of northern Africa would warrant the use of "reoccupation"—of the Sudan, for instance? One might even query how "the expansion of nations in recent years" differs very remarkably in purpose from that phenomenon as visible centuries before? Except for a more detailed treatment of certain portions of the period since 1870, Johnston and Keltie still hold their own in shedding English light on the Dark Continent.

Essays Political and Historical. By Charlemagne Tower, LL.D. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1914, pp. 306.) In these seven unpretentious essays, with sure and light touch, with unusual sense of proportion, with a point of view always independent, the author discusses the great topics of American diplomacy and comments on the larger strategy of the War of Revolution. Skillfully illustrating by means of contemporary letters the incidents of the Boston and York-

town campaigns, he makes the characters of Cornwallis and Sir William Howe really vivid in few and simple words. No one can account for Howe's extraordinary lethargy: but Mr. Tower certainly throws light upon it when he emphasizes that general's self-indulgent habits and reflects upon the prevalent dissipation of the period. In like manner the long-standing difference between Howe and Cornwallis, coupled with the latter's political liberality and personal kindliness, go far to explain the latter's failure. Fortunate it was for the cause of the colonies, that British arms were so inefficiently led.

In his remarks upon diplomacy as a profession, the personal note is everywhere evident, and in a charming way Mr. Tower describes the nature and value of the service. Value the diplomat has, for as the author says, it is "the things which may take place at any moment and unexpectedly, that make him useful and important in his place"; and "when you do want his services you want them very much". We realize this to-day as never before.

The diplomatic topics are the canal, arbitration, expatriation, extradition, and the modern humanitarian codes, and the Monroe Doctrine.

If a series of "don'ts" were issued to our diplomatic corps, the first should read, "Don't discuss the Monroe Doctrine". Mr. Tower is much too correct to have violated this rule while in the service, but once retired from it, the temptation is irresistible. His treatment is unusual however, in that it aims at giving the European attitude toward this "declaration of American national political faith", which naturally is adverse, as not founded in law and not justified by the need of self-defense. But the author is sure nevertheless that "no European government to-day would think either of establishing a colony or attempting to occupy territory on the American continent without considering in that connection the attitude of the United States", which is a safe statement.

The sketches of our treaty obligations as to the Panama Canal and of our share in international arbitration are slighter, yet here too one is aware of a certain independence in the point of view, of emphasis on the essentials, which is of value. So too in the long essay entitled, Some Modern Developments of International Law, there is original thought and an illuminating insight into things that have really counted. These thoughts, scattered yet germane, by a man of cultivated mind and diplomatic experience, so agreeably placed before the reader, make one more than ever regret that our service is deprived of his skill and judgment.

T. S. Woolsey.

An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America for the Years 1757, 1758, 1759, and 1760. By Captain John Knox. Edited with introduction, appendix, and index by Arthur G. Doughty. Volume I. [Publications of the Champlain Society, vol. VIII.] (Toronto, the

Champlain Society, 1914, pp. xxiii, 512.) The *Journal* of Captain John Knox is well known, because it has been one of the main authorities used in modern standard works on North American history in the years 1757–1760. Parkman in *Montcalm and Wolfe* makes his own skillful use of Knox, quoting his best stories. Knox is therefore an old friend to many who may never have read his book, which, as we are told in the editor's preface, has become very rare and is now reprinted for the first time. It is well reprinted and well edited, as would be expected from Dr. Doughty and such collaborators as Professor Ganong, whose notes on the author's description of Nova Scotia are most interesting.

The first volume does not include the fall of Quebec. Knox saw no fighting, other than bush fighting, in 1757 and 1758. His account of the capture of Louisburg is the account of an eye-witness, but the eye-witness was not himself, for he was for over twenty-two months doing garrison duty in Nova Scotia, "an inglorious exile", until his regiment joined Wolfe's army in 1759. Perhaps the chief historical value of this first part consists in the evidence which it supplies that, in spite of the deportation of the Acadians, the British occupation of Acadia had been little more than nominal: the forts were tumbling down, and if the soldiers went outside them they ran risk of being scalped, "the French and Indians disputing the country with us on every occasion, inch by inch, even within the range of our artillery".

Not much light is thrown on the important subject of the relations between the regular and the provincial troops, but it is surprising to find Knox on three separate occasions (pp. 28, 160, and 283) drawing a very poor picture of New England skippers and seamen as showing want of nerve in emergency and being pulled through by English soldiers and sailors with forcible language.

Knox evidently loved writing and books, as shown by his plea for good regimental libraries. His narrative, in spite of the number of army orders, is clear, interesting, and always to the point. He is accurate in fact, fair in statement, and has great power of description with an Irishman's sense of humor. The drawback to his work is absence of criticism, amounting to want of discrimination. He does not help us to form a clear idea of the comparative merits and demerits of the leading men. There is a clerical error in the first note on page 67. Fort William Henry stood at the southern extremity of Lake George not the northern.

C. P. Lucas.

Welsh Settlement of Pennsylvania. By Charles H. Browning. (Philadelphia, 1912, pp. 631.) Mr. Browning's chief rôle in the preparation of this volume was that of searcher, compiler, and editor of the records bearing upon the history of the Welsh Quakers in Penn's province. And this part of his task he has done well, evidently spending a great deal of time and patient labor in his pursuits and in consequence

offering a rich quarry of information. This book will be welcomed by those whose interest is local and filial. The genealogist will find in it an abundance of biographical and pedigree material to gladden his heart. The descendants of the Welsh will find it replete with details of the early sufferings and experiences of their ancestors both in the home-land and in the new land of their religious and social development, and of the industrial and topographical changes in the Welsh Tract. The antiquarian and the curious will find therein much lore and interesting detail. And while the circle of attention is narrowed to a particular people and the particular region in which they dwelt, the circle of interest and value is much broader. The general student of early American history will welcome the book because of the additional as well as new light it throws upon many of the vital phases of colonial life. The causes of migration, the character of the people, the cost of transportation, the land system, the size and value of estates, white servitude, the cost of cattle, clothing, and provisions, local government, the conflicts between the divergent interests of settler and proprietor, and other items which constitute the vital facts in the history of the planting and development of the English colonies in America are here set forth.

Mr. Browning as an author is not free from the faults of the filial historian who holds a brief for a particular party or people. There is indeed much in the history and character of the sturdy Welsh settlers to elicit praise and there is much in the life of William Penn hard to understand. And there is evidence to show that Penn was not fair in his dealings with the Welsh when he failed to keep his promise to grant them a tract for their own use in which they were to enjoy a considerable measure of local self-government. When their hopes were destroyed their hearts were embittered against the proprietor and this hostile attitude Mr. Browning reflects. It has led him to deal unfairly with Penn and to blacken his character with the arts of insinuation and innuendo. This is not history.

The book is well indexed separately for names and subjects.

W. T. Root.

Colonial Trade of Maryland, 1689–1715. By Margaret Shove Morriss, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Mount Holyoke College. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series XXXII., no. 3.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1914, pp. viii, 157.) This is a close study from both manuscripts and printed sources of "the place which the province of Maryland held in the British colonial system", a place which was "regarded as satisfactory to the home country from the mercantilist point of view", but a place in which the colonists were supinely subservient to the system and to the tobacco industry. Dr. Morriss finds that while Maryland was producing annually about 25,000 hogsheads or 10,000,000 pounds of tobacco and getting in return rarely more than £80,000 chiefly in English manufac-

tures, the home government was deriving a revenue from the crop of £36,000 or more, and the English tobacco merchants were reaping sufficiently large profits to cause them to become a powerful support to the system. "The bay and the rivers teemed with fish . . . yet there is not a single record of fish exported to England between 1696 and 1715." Fruits, also, were plentiful but there was very little inclination to produce food stuffs of any kind for export. There was a small exportation of furs, but fully eighty per cent. of this was from the Eastern Shore, the inhabitants being too much afraid of the western Indians to trade with them. A Scotch-Irish settlement in Somerset County on the Eastern Shore manufactured most of their own clothing as well as some for their neighbors, and the popular branch of the colonial legislature occasionally desired to encourage manufactures, but the interests easily stifled such tendencies and kept the inhabitants shackled to tobacco. The more tobacco, the larger the governor's salary. The tobacco merchants endeavored to use their influence in the appointment of the governor, and the members of the upper house of the legislature were appointed by the crown upon the recommendation of the governor. The cheap labor, too, of the indentured servants and negro slaves sustained the tobacco industry.

Dr. Morriss has made a thorough search for facts pertaining to her subject, and presented them clearly and with good judgment. It may, however, seem unfair to Lord Baltimore to suggest his interest in the revenue as a controlling motive for vetoing the act limiting the production of tobacco (p. 24). It is an error to state that "the English officials in Maryland were almost entirely supported by the income derived from an export duty" on tobacco (p. 47); the governor was so supported, but the other officers were paid chiefly in fees. The "Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum", to which reference is frequently made, was printed in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XII. 327–340.

N. D. M.

Colonial Mansions of Maryland and Delaware. By John Martin Hammond. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1914, pp. xii, 304.) This work presents the home life and official dignities, with family traditions more or less well authenticated, of some thirty-seven of the notable houses and their owners in Maryland and Delaware. The photographs are unusually fine, and in the grouping of owners at the head of each chapter, with data from original sources as to cost and time consumed in erection, early occupancy and ownership, valuable information is given, as in the cases of the Lloyd-Chase and the Hammond-Harwood houses of the Annapolis group.

In Prince George County, one has glimpses of the vast possessions of Richard Snowden, iron-master of Potuxon Forge, of Belair, with fine old tales of the turf and close ties of the Tasker-Ogle-Bladen connection over seas, and of Mount Airy the patrimony of Benedict Calvert.

Howard County contributes Doughoregan Manor and its patriarchal colonies of Carrolls, Burleigh of the Hammonds, Belmont of the Dorsey-Hanson clan, while in Baltimore County the Ridgelys hold stately Hampton. On the Eastern Shore the survival of five great homes represents the Lloyds of Wye. At Beverly, the Dennis family continues in possession, and Plain Dealing keeps its memories of Chamberlaines, long lords of the soil.

The all too scant chronicles of seven important houses of Delaware are interestingly given, especially in the case of Ridgely of Dover, which registers so many historic names, Moores, Wemyss, Rodney, and the beautiful Vining women; and including the Dickinson and Thomas mansions, the estates are still held by these families.

Among numerous proof-errors, the Abbé Robin masquerades as Rodin, Buckley as Buckler, while on page 43 William Paca's daughter espouses "Consul Roubelle". Paca's girls died early, but the son of Rewbell, the Director, Jerome Bonaparte's aide, married in 1804 at Baltimore Henrietta Pascault (pronounced Packa) of the French emigration from Santo Domingo.

A. M. L. S.

The History of Brown University, 1764–1914. By Walter C. Bronson, Litt.D., Professor of English Literature. (Providence, published by the University, 1914, pp. x, 548.) Brown University, under the name of Rhode Island College, was chartered by the colonial assembly in 1764. Last autumn it celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. As a part of the celebration, Professor Bronson was commissioned to write a history of the university. Abundant materials for the task appear to exist; for the earlier period, indeed, the author has found a quite surprising number and variety of sources to use and quote. With their aid, and especially with that of Dr. Ezra Stiles's *Literary Diary,* he has given a much fuller and more convincing exposition than has ever before been offered of the process, somewhat intricate and open to sectarian controversy, by which the college charter was brought to enactment. That charter had some striking peculiarities, but the principal of these, and one reflecting great credit on its makers, was that it recognized, more broadly and fundamentally than other college charters of the period, the principle of freedom from religious tests and the idea of denominational co-operation.

Few if any American college histories have been better written than the first three-fourths of this. The last quarter, embracing the events of the last fifty years, is less successful, partly because crowded with too many details, partly because the writer makes little attempt to relate the story to the general history of modern times in the United States and in Rhode Island. For the earlier chapters, the background of colonial society, the movements of the Revolutionary period, the characters of individuals, have been carefully studied; and perhaps the author, as a

professor of English, has found it easier to interpret in an entertaining manner the history of an institution in which, as was the case for the first sixty years, success in literary achievement was the end chiefly sought. Certainly all this part is very engaging, and may be read with profit by the student of general American history, while to the "Brown man" and the student of old Rhode Island it will be a delight. But Dr. Bronson also sets forth interestingly and justly the character and work of Francis Wayland, president 1826–1855, whose function it was, by breezes of fresh air, to sweep the university out of the weakly literary doldrums in which, in common with most American colleges of that period, it lay becalmed, and to set its course toward an education more completely adapted to the actual conditions of American life. Wayland was a man of extraordinary power, whose impress on the institution was deeper than that of any other individual in its history. The reigns of his successors lie too near us for final treatment, but Professor Bronson has narrated the modern developments with great fidelity, accuracy, and good judgment.

Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789. Edited from the Original Records in the Library of Congress by Gaillard Hunt, Chief, Division of Manuscripts. Volumes XXII., XXIII., 1782, January 1–August 9, August 12–December 31. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1914, pp. ix, 1–460, 461–917.) The first noticeable fact concerning the *Journals* for 1782 is that two volumes suffice for the records of the year, whereas from 1776 to 1781 three volumes were requisite for each year, although the volumes for 1781 had shown a diminution in size. It is further noticeable that the journals proper are even more meagre than the size of the volumes would indicate, and that many deficiencies in the record are supplied, so far as possible, by other papers of Congress. For instance the course of proceedings, including the appointment of committees and changes in personnel and even the consideration of measures, is often traceable only through endorsements on committee reports, and by means of the committee books, while numerous motions made are known only from scattered papers.

The proceedings of the year are to a considerable extent characterized by a furtherance of the programme of constructive legislation begun the year before (see this Review, XVIII. 632, 840). Among the first of these consummations was the plan of a consular convention with France. The duties of the secretary of Congress were elaborated and defined, and the great seal, the device for which was adopted in June, was put into his keeping. The departments of foreign affairs and war were reorganized and new regulations for subordinate departments of the army and for the post-office were adopted.

In other ways also, while the negotiations for peace were dragging along, efforts were made toward settling down into a national rôle. An elaborate report of the superintendent of finance upon the state of com-

merce, including a plan for its protection, was sent to France for the concurrence of that government; a treaty of commerce was concluded with Sweden, and negotiations for similar treaties with other powers progressed. The question of the navigation of the Mississippi, afterward to become of prime importance, made its appearance.

The most vital problem, however, which Congress had to consider was that of its finances. The system of requisitions had almost completely broken down, and the proposed five per cent. impost had not yet been accepted by all the states. In March a proposed circular letter to the states earnestly calling for funds had first been emasculated and then rejected altogether because of its revelations of the government's weakness. Committees of Congress were sent to plead with the state governments, but accomplished little. A land tax was proposed but difficulties in its application could not be surmounted.

Meanwhile the French government had given notice that no further loans would be made and asked for an accounting. The solution of the problem seemed to lie in the cession by the claimant states of their western lands and the sale of these for the common benefit. Much, however, if not all, depended on peace, and an acceptable peace depended on the government's being able to hold up its head. Rhode Island's outright rejection of the five per cent. impost and Virginia's repeal of her assent dashed all hopes from that measure, and in the last days of the year new difficulties appeared in the negotiations for peace. The year closed on a rather gloomy prospect.

E. C. B.

The West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution. By Paul Chrisler Phillips, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, University of Montana. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. II., nos. 2 and 3.] (Urbana, University of Illinois, 1914, pp. 247.) Mr. Phillips makes a valuable contribution to the history of the Old Northwest. His researches among French archives enable him to draw an engaging portrait of Vergennes: the French minister aids the colonies in order to humiliate England; he becomes interested in the new nation he helps to create by the fact of recognition by France; and although he must have the aid of Spain, he will not further the greed of that nation in its extreme endeavors to make the Gulf of Mexico a Spanish lake and to gain the exclusive control of the navigation of the Mississippi. On the other hand, he has no sympathy with the American projects to conquer Canada; and when Jay and Adams are led into direct negotiations with England, thereby disregarding instructions of Congress and proving ungrateful for the help France has given the colonies, Vergennes tolerantly and good-naturedly commends them for being smarter diplomats than himself. If Franklin, the aged and infirm, had not been pushed aside by his colleagues, Ontario would have been included within our boundaries. Mr. Phillips has ascertained that the West existed during the Revolution, not only in the minds of Virginians, who were furnishing

men and means for the conquest of that region; but also in Congress and in the courts of France, Spain, and England. Future study is needed to develop the large body of information in regard to the West which evidently exists both in foreign archives and in hitherto unused sources in this country. Mr. Phillips in his valuable studies of Vergennes and Florida Blanca does less than justice to John Jay. He has not studied carefully the Oswald correspondence, and does not sufficiently appreciate the game Jay played with that negotiator. He is diffuse; he repeats himself; he runs back and forth over his chronological boundaries, so that he puzzles the reader. For use in similes western history seems to have forsaken chess for poker (pp. 26, 81).

CHARLES MOORE.

The Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina. By H. M. Henry, M.A., Professor of History and Economics, Emory and Henry College. (Emory, Virginia, 1914, pp. x, 216.) The author of this monograph endorses the opinion that the slaves "were controlled more by men than by laws; that the statutes were placed on the books chiefly for emergency use, but under ordinary circumstances many of them were dead letters". Accordingly he has treated public opinion and to some extent private conduct as well as the course of legislation and official practice. In so doing he has made use of a wide range of material, including pamphlets, newspapers, and the manuscript court records of a number of counties. The data from these last, though necessarily meagre, are especially welcome. The negroes, whether slave or free, are shown to have had poor prospects of full and fair trial when carried into court on criminal charges. For example, Governor Adams wrote in 1855 of the negro courts: "Their decisions are rarely in conformity with justice or humanity. I have felt constrained in a majority of cases brought to my notice either to modify the sentence or to set it aside altogether" (p. 60). An outstanding feature of the book is in fact the frequent expression quoted from leading officials and journals of a desire for the reform and mitigation of the laws. These demands met little response from the legislature, for reasons which the author from time to time suggests. But their occurrence at least indicates a sentiment among the more responsible citizens tending to keep the number of negro prosecutions within small compass; and the executions for capital crimes appear to have been correspondingly few. The scope of Dr. Henry's monograph includes the whole range of the negroes' relations to the ante-bellum law. The style is that which is unhappily common in doctoral dissertations, but the substance contains distinct contributions to knowledge.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

John Ross and the Cherokee Indians. By Rachel Caroline Eaton, A.M. (Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1914, pp. 212.) Rachel Caroline Eaton's *John Ross and the Cherokee Indians*

is practically the first truly historical Indian biography that has been produced. It is built upon a foundation of sources and authorities that are, in all respects, accredited and is, on the whole, a very readable, reliable narrative. Among the sources used appear Cherokee national records on file at Tahlequah; private papers of the Ross family; manuscripts collected by John Howard Payne during his residence in the Cherokee country east; manuscripts in the possession of the Sequoyah Historical Society; and the records of the United States Indian Office.

The inclusion by Mrs. Eaton of the source last-named is unfortunate to a degree since her use of it could not have been extensive and her references to it are always rather vague. Indian Office Letter-Books and Report Books are all bound, numbered, and paged; Indian Office Files bear definite file marks. Citations, therefore, of any of the foregoing can be definite and ought never to be indefinite. The flat-filing system, now in vogue at the Indian Office, breaks up old bundles but does not, in any way, destroy old sign-posts. Moreover, the Emigration Papers (various tribes), and the Old Settler Papers (Cherokee) have not yet been disturbed by the flat-filing clerks and, if exhaustively examined, might have furnished much additional material for a life of John Ross, although the information afforded might not have affected the general estimate of his work and character.

It seems unfortunate that so well-written a book as Mrs. Eaton's surely is should not have found a better printer and publisher. Typographical errors occur. There is a particularly serious one on pages 94–95, it being a misplacement and duplication of text that even very ordinary proof-reading ought to have been able to avoid. The book is entirely destitute of an index, which would have greatly enhanced its value as a library reference book and as such it ought to rank; for it covers the period of American history from 1811 to 1866 and throws a much needed light upon certain government policies.

Annie Heloise Abel.

Daniel Webster. By Frederic Austin Ogg, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Simmons College, Boston. [American Crisis Biographies, edited by Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer.] (Philadelphia, George W. Jacobs and Company, 1914, pp. 433.) Another biography of Daniel Webster, and one which amply justifies itself. Professor Ogg has had the advantage over his predecessors that arises from the publication of Van Tyne's *Letters of Daniel Webster,* in 1902, and of the exhaustive "national" edition of his *Writings and Speeches,* in 1903. Although the new sources, of which he has made frequent and effective use, add nothing of first-rate importance to what was already known of the life of Webster, yet they do throw light upon some interesting events in that life, and admit the reader to a view of the great statesman's opinions throughout his public career.

As a whole the work may be characterized as a model biography—

that is, one that has been compiled with painstaking thoroughness and in a commendably judicious temper. It is accurate and correct, not merely in its narrative of Webster's course of action upon the many questions to which Webster's speeches were addressed, but in its exposition of the circumstances and the issues involved. Only one well versed in the political history of the country, or one who studied each situation carefully before attempting to set it forth in words, could have dealt with so many episodes in that history without making—so far as the writer has been able to discover—a single misstatement. That is not quite the same thing as saying that all of his judgments commend themselves to this writer, but Professor Ogg may not have had in his mind the eventuality of this review.

The work has the merits and the faults of a "model" biography. It omits nothing. It misstates nothing. It is, on a large scale, such a biography as would be adapted admirably to a cyclopaedia or a dictionary of national biography. On the other hand, one wonders at the absence of evidence of the author's personal enthusiasm for his subject. Incidentally he quotes, and undoubtedly endorses, a few of the many tributes paid by Webster's contemporaries to his extraordinary powers, and to the impression he made upon his auditors and upon those who read his speeches; but he restrains himself, almost coldly, at times, from adding the eulogistic comment which his readers would surely have pardoned. No doubt a biographer should maintain a judicial frame of mind, and should refrain from too effusive praise of his subject; but should he leave so exclusively to others the expression of admiration when he is writing the life of one so great as to have been characterized by the late Lord Russell of Killowen as "perhaps the greatest forensic figure the world has ever seen"?[1]

The book is written with admirable clearness, and is furnished with a good index and an ample bibliography. Two minor points which may deserve attention in future editions, may be noted. The name of Mr. Mangum of North Carolina (p. 280) was not William but Willie, and it was not a nickname. Also, half a dozen times in the book the author uses the word *apropos* as a preposition, without the following "of"—which is not good English outside of the newspapers.

EDWARD STANWOOD.

The Life and Public Services of J. Glancy Jones. By Charles Henry Jones. In two volumes. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1910, pp. xvi, 388, viii, 388.) This purports to be a biography of one who was a close personal and political friend of James Buchanan; and who was successively and successfully, if we may believe the author's constant asseverations, first an Episcopal rector, then a lawyer and deputy attorney-general for Berks County, Pennsylvania, an ultra states' rights representative in Congress, 1851–1858, serving as chairman of the

[1] In *The Youth's Companion*, February 13, 1896.

committee of ways and means, and who finally closed his public life as United States minister to Austria, 1858–1861. The strictly biographical portion of the work, consisting of about one hundred pages, is devoted to the ancestry and early life of Mr. Jones previous to his first activity in politics in the presidential campaign of 1844. The remainder of the work is more accurately described as material for a biography.

Numerous political speeches by Mr. Jones are reproduced *in extenso* from newspapers and even from the *Congressional Globe*. An appendix of over two hundred pages includes ten letters from James Buchanan, written between June, 1854, and March, 1856, while Buchanan was minister to England, and containing among other things a few remarks pertinent to the approaching Democratic national convention of 1856. The greater part of the appendix consists of official correspondence and despatches of Mr. Jones while serving at Vienna. Here one finds interesting, though not especially illuminating, discussions of questions related to the then recent Declaration of Paris, principally concerning the position of leading powers toward the American proposal to exempt private enemy property from capture at sea. There are also numerous and interesting comments upon contemporary European national and international politics.

The chief defects of this *Life* appear in the eulogistic and uncritical attitude of the author, and in the inclusion in the diplomatic correspondence of much that is of no historical or biographical value whatever, and of lengthy official documents emanating from the Austrian government on the Hungarian complications, 1860–1861, which serve no useful purpose in a work of this kind. A considerable amount of other irrelevant matter is to be found elsewhere, and not a few speeches and running Congressional debates, given in full, might advantageously have been summarized.

The work is well written, and the historical setting when given is generally well done although at times this is colored by the author's obvious sympathy for the extreme Southern position on the question of slavery in the territories, especially in the discussion of the Kansas struggle. Perhaps the portion which is of greatest historical value is that which relates to the formation of Buchanan's Cabinet, the wide expectation that Mr. Jones would be given a portfolio, and the factional contest in Pennsylvania which resulted in preventing his appointment (vol. I., ch. XIX.). The format is highly creditable both to author and publisher.

P. Orman Ray.

The True Ulysses S. Grant. By Charles King, Brig.-General U. S. V., 1898–1899. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1914, pp. 400.) The writer has essayed an historical problem of extreme difficulty—the portrayal of the life and character of a military hero and political party leader while the threads of facts and fables spun by friends

and enemies are still so enmeshed as to require the hand of the surest critic to unravel the tangle. His qualifications for this task are: a West Point education, a knowledge of post-Civil War frontier life, and a reputation as the leading novelist of American army life. Both story and character are those of the Grand Army of the Republic campfire and of the latter-day war reminiscences of the generals rather than the Grant of his contemporaries or of his own despatches. Grant is presented as the born leader and ruler of destiny displaying from infancy onward the indications of coming greatness to those who had the eyes to see. His deeds in the Mexican campaigns, in which his regimental commander mentioned in his report simply that Grant "was usefully employed in his appropriate duties", become in the hands of this biographer deeds of brilliant valor.

In dealing with the Civil War period the author is not free from bias both for the side of the North and for Grant as against all rivals, except Sherman and Thomas. Where Grant is present all successes are due to him alone, while all faults and failures are due to others, except where Grant in his *Memoirs* has acknowledged otherwise. Any serious military appreciation of Grant's generalship has not been attempted.

The book is marred by a somewhat rambling style and a frequent resort to army slang, which is neither forceful nor suggestive of Grant.

The chapters on Grant at West Point, which appear to be based largely on the writer's own experiences there some twenty years later, are the best and possess charm and color. Twenty-eight photographs display Grant's birthplace and various abodes, including his farmhouse, and many portraits of him and his Civil War comrades, but the unpublished ones are of antiquarian rather than historic interest.

A. L. Conger.

George Hamilton Perkins, Commodore, U. S. N.: his Life and Letters. By Carroll Storrs Alden. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xii, 302.) There has been such a dearth of published narratives and printed letters of American naval officers, that the appearance of such a biography as this is indeed to be welcomed. The official reports forwarded to the Navy Department give us the facts most accurately; the ships' log-books confirm those facts beyond a doubt; but the real story is never known until it is brought to light by the personal accounts of the officers and men who actually participated in the events recounted. It is for this reason that Commodore Perkins's letters, breathing deep of the atmosphere of the sea in the days when sails were slowly giving place to steam, takes us back better even than the historian's scholarly pen to the decks of ships that cruised in an age both picturesque and adventurous.

To the midshipman of to-day there is much comfort in Dr. Alden's account of Perkins's Naval Academy experiences, for these, while different in many particulars from those of the present time, were strangely

like the difficulties, anxieties, and pleasures suffered or enjoyed by the young naval students of the twentieth century. But this is only an introduction to a more interesting theme. Perkins's cruise to the slave coast of West Africa portrays a picture of our old navy heretofore very little known. In his letters written from before New Orleans, from the West Gulf Coast, and from the memorable bay of Mobile, Perkins gives us an account of service under Farragut which is a distinct contribution to the history of the Civil War. And then follows a chapter on Perkins's "later service", in which are quoted what are, perhaps, his most interesting letters, describing his visit to Siam. The concluding pages of the book tell us of the commodore's life on a New Hampshire farm and of his keen enjoyment of spending thus his "retired" years after his experiences afloat of the hardships and delights of the sailor's life. It is an excellent book, an entertaining biography, an important contribution to the history of our navy; and Dr. Alden is to be congratulated for compiling Commodore Perkins's letter and for doing that work so well.

Memorials of Eminent Yale Men: a Biographical Study of Student Life and University Influences during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By Anson Phelps Stokes. In two volumes. (New Haven, Yale University Press, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. xxii, 368; 452.) While the major title of this work indicates the character of its principal contents, it is in the secondary title that is found the key to its chief purpose. In other words, the aim of the author is not merely to present biographies of Yale men who have attained eminence, but through these biographical studies to set forth something of the life, spirit, and influence of Yale during two centuries of its existence. Out of something more than ten thousand graduates deceased when the quinquennial catalogue of 1910 was issued the author has selected seventy-nine men "of large influence", of whom extended biographies are given, and a supplementary list of the same number, "whose careers are only slightly less significant". These are more briefly sketched. In all cases it is college life and influences that receive the greater emphasis.

"Eminence", the basis of selection, involves, according to the author, "noble qualities of mind and soul", not mere notoriety, "a constructive contribution of broad or enduring significance to the history, thought, or inspiration of the American people". The men thus selected are classified as divines, authors, educational leaders, scholars, men of science, inventors and artists, statesmen, lawyers and jurists, patriots and soldiers.

"There is no field of activity", says Mr. Stokes, "in which Yale's influence has been greater than in that of religion", and he instances four constructive movements in the history of religion to which Yale has made notable contributions. Likewise the university's contribution to education has been notable, one evidence being the long list of college

presidents furnished by Yale. On the other hand the contribution to literature has been relatively small, and a somewhat similar statement is made concerning the field of scholarship, excepting philology and natural science. In the field of statesmanship Yale's position is conspicuous, for Yale graduates were prominent in the Continental Congress, in the Constitutional Convention, and have occupied almost every post of importance in the federal government, from the presidency down. Only a little less prominent is the university's place in the domain of law and jurisprudence, for she has sent forth such men as James Kent, Theodore D. Woolsey, Judah P. Benjamin, and Francis Wharton, and besides has given to the Supreme Court of the United States two chief justices and seven associate justices. Among inventors she claims Eli Whitney and S. F. B. Morse, the latter also an artist of note before he was an inventor.

A long-time "hobby" of the author has been the gathering of autograph letters and documents signed by eminent "Yalensians", and the pages of these volumes are enriched by the production, in whole or in part, of many of these letters. Finally, the author has given a sort of finishing touch to his work by the inclusion of three valuable essays: "Historical Factors of Influence at Yale", "Common Characteristics of most Eminent Yale Men", and "Historic Universities in a Democracy", the latter reprinted from the *Yale Review* of July, 1913.

The French Revolution in San Domingo. By T. Lothrop Stoddard, A.M., Ph.D. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xviii, 410.) In 1789 the French part of Santo Domingo was the most prosperous of European colonies. Here lived some forty thousand whites and a little more than half that number of free mulattoes engaged in the common exploitation of some half a million African slaves. With the advent of the revolutionary spirit, however, factional strife arose and eventually a horrible race war ensued; the prosperity of the colony was entirely swept away, the white population was annihilated, and the black state of Haiti had its beginning. It is with this "first great shock between the ideals of white supremacy and race equality" that Dr. Stoddard's book deals. The five opening chapters are of an introductory nature, describing conditions in the colony on the eve of the Revolution. The body of the book falls under two main heads: the dissensions leading to the general collapse of white authority in the year 1793, and the progress of black supremacy as personified in the career of Toussaint Louverture. The story is brought to a close with the coronation, in 1804, of the negro Dessalines as Emperor of Haiti.

In preparing the introductory chapters and those dealing with the years 1789–1791, the author had before him six or eight monographs of indifferent quality and half a dozen of the most accessible books written by contemporaries. The modicum of archival material which he might have examined for these chapters he disregarded, as he did also the pamphlet literature, the official minutes of the Constituent Assembly,

and the journals containing the debates. But in the preparation of subsequent chapters he brought under requisition the collections of manuscript sources in the various archives of Paris. This is the most original portion of the book. After the year 1795 he returned, in part, to secondary material, leaning heavily on Roloff and Poyen.

The book makes a valuable contribution to the literature of the French Revolution in that it gives for the first time a consecutive account, based on scientific monographs and primary sources, of the factional quarrels, the class struggles, and the military campaigns in Santo Domingo during the troublous period of 1789–1804. Though minor errors may be discovered in the statement of facts, the style is simple, clear, and often happy. As if to avoid the appearance of technical scholarship and thus attract the general reader, the author relegates his notes of reference to the back of the book; but at the same time he humors the whim of the special student by appending a brief critical bibliography. The book has no index.

MITCHELL B. GARRETT.

Latin America: Clark University Addresses. Edited by George H. Blakeslee, Professor of History, Clark University. (New York, G. E. Stechert and Company, 1914, pp. xii, 388.) It is often a question whether any conference held to discuss a matter of huge scope serves a useful purpose beyond that of affording an opportunity for those in attendance to exchange views and become personally acquainted. When no specific phase of the subject is assigned and the speakers are allowed the utmost latitude in the selection of their themes, the result is apt to be a miscellany of side-lights. Occasionally such gleams are illuminating in their respective precincts, even if they intensify somewhat the gloom of the larger areas.

In pronouncing these *obiter dicta* the reviewer does not wish to single out for criticism the series of addresses contained in the present volume. They serve merely to exemplify the point he desires to make. Several of the addresses, if published separately as articles, would have been of greater usefulness than they now are in their enforced association. Others are little more than pleasant generalizations that ring with a familiar sound. Put out together, they form a number of fragments slenderly joined by a comprehensive title. In this shape they emphasize the diversity of the theme and not the co-ordination of its parts.

The order in which the addresses are printed shows that the editor recognized their miscellaneous character and tried to group them in some fashion according to topics. They appear to be distributed into the following sections: general or introductory (3); Mexico (5); the Monroe Doctrine (6); economic questions, with especial reference to the Panama Canal and the foreign trade of the United States (5); political relations of the United States, exclusive of the Monroe Doctrine (4); intellectuality and higher education (3); geography and climatology (3). About as many of them deal with the United States in its connection with Latin America as with that region itself.

COMMUNICATION

University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, February 8, 1915.

The Managing Editor of The American Historical Review:

Dear Sir,

On reading, in your January issue, the review of my book on *The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution, and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe,* I recognize the justice of your reviewer's suggestion that there should have been in my volume a more explicit statement of the nature and extent of my debt to my old teacher, Professor Burr, to whom the work is dedicated. It is quite true, as the reviewer points out, that the framework of my book is substantially drawn (though not without omissions, additions, and other changes) from the *Outlines* printed by him for the use of his classes. These outlines, with his consent, I have long used in my own classes, and my lectures, which were the nucleus of my book, naturally grew up about them. But to the doubt of your reviewer as to "how much farther the debt extends, in what degree the treatment of the topics and the interpretation of the larger movements rest upon the ripe instruction of the Cornell master", I owe it both to Professor Burr and to myself to reply that it was never my good fortune to attend his course on this period. The course in the Renaissance and Reformation was not given in 1901–1902, the one year of my study at Cornell. Direct instruction from him I had only in the earlier history of the Middle Ages and in a "seminary" which that year, for a part of the time, studied the history of persecution and tolerance, though I have since owed to his *Outlines* guidance in my reading, and in our long correspondence historical questions have sometimes been discussed.

Let me add that when I wrote to Professor Burr six years ago about plans I had for two or three books he was kind enough to tell me that he thought I could succeed with a book on the Renaissance and Reformation, that I began work on the book as the result of his suggestion, that its limits were those he named, and that the finished manuscript was sent, chapter by chapter, for his approval. It was through his aid, moreover, that it found a publisher. That the vague phrase of my dedication inadequately defined my debt to him I now see; but he at least will not suspect me of any wish to ignore it or even to obscure it.

That my book had no preface as a place for such an explanation was in part because prefaces have become associated in my mind (perhaps without warrant) with the paraphernalia of learning, and I wished

my book to be learned without making a parade of learning—its text self-explanatory and self-sufficient, embodying the explanations sometimes found in foot-notes and including all necessary references to the sources of information. But it was also in part because it was my chief hope, throughout my six years of unceasing work, to write a book that Professor Burr might find acceptable as a text for his classes at Cornell. For Cornell students, with his *Outlines* in their hands, no other acknowledgment was needed than in my dedication; and other readers, as I see plainly now, entered too slightly into my thought.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Maslin Hulme.

HISTORICAL NEWS

Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the University of Chicago, who has been a member of the Board of Editors of this journal since April, 1899, and from 1901 to 1905 was managing editor, resigned from the Board in December. The REVIEW is indebted, to an extent beyond what can be here expressed, to Professor McLaughlin's knowledge, good judgment, and devotion to its interests. Professor Carl Becker of Kansas University was chosen in his place by the Executive Council of the American Historical Association.

A General Index to volumes XI.–XX. of this journal will be prepared as soon as possible after the issue of the July number, which completes vol. XX. This index, as well as that for vols. I.–X. published ten years ago, may be ordered now for $1; after the publication of the second index both will be sold by Macmillans at $1.25 each. This price is for books in paper binding. This may be the proper place to mention that the publishers have appropriate binders for the REVIEW and for these indexes, in black half-morocco, of a uniform and appropriate design.

Readers of this journal will perhaps be interested to know, what may not have been previously explained, that since 1912 Professor George M. Dutcher, of Wesleyan University, Middletown, has given the editors invaluable help by preparing nearly all those items of historical news which are derived from examination of the French, German, and Italian periodicals and pamphlets of each quarter.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The special meeting to be held this summer in California will occupy three days, July 21, 22, and 23, the sessions of those three days being held at San Francisco, Berkeley, and Palo Alto respectively. The morning session of the first day will be devoted to papers on the Spanish American states and the Pacific Ocean; the afternoon session to papers on the United States (especially the Pacific Coast states) and the Pacific Ocean. The morning session of the second day will be occupied with problems connected with the teaching of history and especially of general American and Western American history, the afternoon session with papers upon the exploration of the Pacific Ocean. On the third day the morning session will be devoted to Australia and the Pacific Ocean, the afternoon session to Japan and the Pacific Ocean. Thus the meeting will bear an especial character, appropriate to the occasion, and will make no effort to cover all the fields generally traversed by the Association in its regular meetings. The American Asiatic Association, which holds its meeting on July 19 and 20, is expected to have papers upon the history

of China and the Philippines and of their relations to the Pacific Ocean and to other Asiatic countries. The chairman of the Committee on Programme is Professor Frederic L. Thompson (of Amherst College), who may be addressed at the University of California, Berkeley.

The London Branch of the Association began in January the occupation of a commodious and pleasing room in the new house of the Royal Historical Society, 22 Russell Square, which will hereafter be the address of the London Branch and of its secretary, Mr. Arthur Percival Newton. Mr. Henry P. Biggar has, by vote of the Executive Council, been made treasurer in succession to Miss Frances G. Davenport. The house of the Royal Historical Society, one marked by much dignity and comfort, affords accomodations also for the (English) Historical Association. Members of our London Branch are kindly permitted to use the library of the Royal Historical Society. Persons wishing further information about the London Branch, for use this summer, may write to J. F. Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

Miss Violet Barbour's prize essay, *Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, Secretary of State to Charles II.*, has been published by the Association in a volume of 303 pages. Subscriptions may be sent to the Secretary; the price, to members, is one dollar, to others, $1.50.

The issue for 1913 of the annual bibliography *Writings on American History*, edited by Miss Grace G. Griffin, is expected to appear in April or May. Members of the Association are earnestly requested to increase the sales of this manual. Orders should be sent to the Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut.

In the *Original Narratives* series, *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675–1690*, edited by Professor Charles M. Andrews, was published by Scribner in February. The autumn will see the publication of a volume entitled *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, 1542–1691*, edited by Professor Herbert E. Bolton of the University of California. This volume will consist mainly of pieces which have not hitherto been published in English translation, relating to the history of movements of exploration and occupation in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas.

As has been intimated upon an earlier page, the continued existence of the *History Teacher's Magazine* depends upon the completion of a fund which its Advisory Board of Editors is endeavoring to raise. Success is still far from certain, and friends of the magazine are urged to send subscriptions to the chairman of the board, Professor Henry Johnson, Teachers College, New York City, or to the treasurer of the fund, J. F. Jameson, at the office of this journal.

The January number of the *History Teacher's Magazine* contains a scholarly study, by Professor W. S. Ferguson, of the Founding of the Roman Principate and its Development into a Monarchy, and part I. of

an interesting investigation, by Professor W. F. Russell of the George Peabody College for Teachers at Nashville, into the Early Methods in Teaching History in Secondary Schools. The latter study is concluded in the February number, which also contains a paper by W. Dawson Johnston on the Library and History Study, two articles, "A Fragment of the Passing Frontier" and "The Last American Frontier", by Dr. Mary W. Williams and L. A. Chase, respectively, and an article on the Military Organization of the Roman Empire, by Dr. George H. Allen. The March number includes a suggestive article, Teaching the War, by Dr. G. Stanley Hall, and Recent Aspects of British Electoral Reform, by Dr. Charles Seymour.

PERSONAL

General Charles Francis Adams, president of the American Historical Association in 1901, died at Washington on March 20; he was nearly eighty years old, but had maintained in old age exceptional health and vigor. Born in 1835, the second son of Charles Francis Adams, he served throughout the Civil War as a cavalry officer, and before its close attained the brevet rank of brigadier-general of volunteers. His distinguished military services left a deep impress upon his mind; he was always afterward an eager student of military history, especially of the history of the Civil War, and a keen and vigorous writer upon themes in that field. After the war he became identified with railway interests; for ten years he was a member, for seven years chairman, of the railway commission of Massachusetts, for thirteen years a government director, for six years, 1884–1890, president, of the Union Pacific Railroad. *Chapters of Erie,* published in 1871, established his reputation as a thoughtful and incisive writer on public affairs. Never holding a public office adequate to his remarkable powers, he took a strong interest in the affairs of his town, his state, and the nation, and wrote much on subjects in these fields. Widely informed, clear-headed, disinterested, attached to no party, inheriting from at least three preceding generations an absolutely independent and fearless American mind, he made contributions of signal importance to many public discussions, and showed a high example of rational patriotism. As an overseer of Harvard University during twenty-four years, he exerted a notable influence on American higher education there and elsewhere. The last twenty-five years of his life were largely devoted, in spite of many public services and public addresses, to American history, his first publications in that field being two Prince Society volumes (Morton's *New English Canaan* and *Antinomianism*), an excellent life of R. H. Dana (1890), and *Three Episodes of Massachusetts History* (1892). In 1895 he was elected president of the Massachusetts Historical Society, which thereafter constantly received for twenty years the benefits of his care, his generosity, his energizing power, and his modernness of view. Most of what he wrote in these twenty years was contributed to the society's *Proceedings*—vig-

orous and entertaining papers like those collected in *Lee at Appomattox and other Papers* (1902) and *Studies Military and Diplomatic* (1911), relating sometimes to the military history of the Revolution, sometimes to the Secession controversy, which he treated with characteristic magnanimity, but of late more often to the diplomatic history of the United States in the period from 1861 to 1872, the period of his father's diplomatic career. In 1900 he published a brief biography of his father which is one of the best volumes in the *American Statesmen* series, and during all his remaining years he was occupied, with abundant materials but with many interruptions, in the preparation of a larger biography. All students of the period will lament that only part of it is completed, for Mr. Adams had an unrivalled knowledge of the field, and gifts of clear and vivid historical exposition that should have had an ampler field of exercise than was afforded by any of his published books. To this journal he was, throughout its history, a valued contributor. His interest in the American Historical Association continued active after the year of his presidency, and he was often the host of the Executive Council at the time of its annual meeting. As host at dinners he was seen at his best—hospitable, genial, and immensely entertaining by reason of his great store of experience and remembrance, and the humor and pungency of his speech. Sometimes gruff in manner, he was at heart notably kind, especially to younger men; and he was a fine model of independent, manly, and vigorous, but cultivated and generous character.

Paul Viollet, professor of the history of civil and canon law in the École des Chartes and librarian of the law faculty of Paris, died on November 22, 1914, aged sixty-four years. He edited for the Society of the History of France the *Établissements de Saint-Louis* (1881–1886) and wrote and edited much else relative to Saint Louis. His best-known works are *Précis de l'Histoire du Droit Français* (2 vols., 1884–1886; second ed. 1893) and *Histoire des Institutions Politiques et Administratives de la France* (3 vols., 1890–1893).

Joseph Déchelette, director of the Museum of Roanne, died of wounds received at Vic-sur-Aisne on October 3, 1914, at the age of fifty-three years. He was the author of the masterly *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique, Celtique, et Gallo-Romaine* (4 vols., 1910–1913), which he left incomplete.

Robert Pöhlmann, professor of ancient history in the University of Munich, died on September 27, 1914, aged sixty-two years. His most important work was *Geschichte des Antiken Kommunismus und Sozialismus* (1893–1901; new edition, 1913).

Miss Katharine Coman, professor emeritus of economics and sociology in Wellesley College, and author of an *Industrial History of the United States* (1905) and of *The Economic Beginnings of the Far West* (1911), died on January 11.

Father Franz Ehrle, S.J., prefect of the Vatican Library since 1893, helpful friend of all who in that period have worked in library or archives, and the originator of the consultation-library and many other aids to investigators there, has resigned his position, and has been succeeded by Dr. Achille Ratti, hitherto prefect of the Ambrosiana at Milan.

Mr. George P. Winship, who has been librarian of the John Carter Brown Library for twenty years—beginning even before it became a public institution—has resigned this position to become librarian of the Widener Collection in the library of Harvard University.

At Yale Dr. Hiram Bingham has been made professor of Latin American history.

At Columbia University Dr. Charles A. Beard and Dr. Vladimir G. Simkhovitch have been advanced to the full rank of professors, of history and of economic history respectively, Dr. Carlton Hayes has been made associate professor, and Dr. B. B. Kendrick assistant professor.

Professor Dana C. Munro of the University of Wisconsin has been called to and has accepted the chair of medieval history in Princeton University.

Professor L. Van der Essen of the University of Louvain is lecturing at the University of Chicago from January to June in Belgian history and other historical fields.

GENERAL

The editors of the *Revue des Questions Historiques* have announced the suspension of publication of that review until the close of the war. The *Revue Historique* and the *Historische Zeitschrift* have continued to appear. Other historical reviews in Germany and France have either failed to appear or have appeared at irregular intervals since the outbreak of the war.

Among the recent volumes on the problems of history are the second and concluding volume of Kemmerich, *Das Kausalgesetz der Weltgeschichte* (Munich, Langen, 1914); A. Görland, *Ethik als Kritik der Weltgeschichte* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914); J. Hirsch, *Die Genesis des Ruhmes: ein Beitrag zur Methodenlehre der Geschichte* (Leipzig, Barth, 1914, pp. xv, 286); W. Bauer, *Die Oeffentliche Meinung und ihre Geschichtlichen Grundlagen* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1914); an English translation, with the title *Historical Materialism and the Economics of Karl Marx* (London, Latimer, 1914, pp. 212), of the work of B. Croce; and L. Berg, *Das Problem der Klimaänderung in Geschichtlicher Zeit* (Leipzig, Teubner).

A. C. McClurg and Company will bring out *The Teaching of History*, by Oskar Jäger, translated by H. J. Claytor.

The January *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library contains (pp. 9–126) a list of works in that library relating to Persia. It is announced that the check-list of newspapers and official gazettes which in the December number came to the end of the alphabetical series of cities, will

be completed by the addition of two indexes and printed as a separate publication. The February *Bulletin,* besides a list of books on the European war recently added, contains a selected list of references on the economic and social aspects of war in general. The acquisition of a part of the papers of Hon. Perry G. Childs of Cazenovia, N. Y., 1817–1822, state senator and member of the Council of Appointment, is noted. But the main contents of the *Bulletin* is a general account of the new manuscript division, by Victor H. Paltsits, keeper of manuscripts, followed by a list of the library's manuscript collections supplementary to that published in 1901.

Vol. XXI., no. 1, of the *Antikvarisk Tidskrift för Sverige* (pp. 192) consists entirely of the first installment of a treatise by Professor Oscar Montelius on the forms, construction, and development of the human dwelling, from prehistoric times, based on material drawn from the most varied regions, and with many illustrations.

S. Krauss has collected in a small volume several *Studien zur Byzantinisch-Jüdischen Geschichte* (Vienna, 1914, pp. vii, 160). N. Ferorelli has prepared an account of *Gli Ebrei nell' Italia Meridionale dall' Età Romana al Secolo XVIII.* (Turin, *Il Vessillo Israelitico,* 1915, pp. 262). The seventeenth centenary of the death of Maimonides is commemorated by the two volumes of *Mose ben Maimon: Leben, Werke, und Einfluss* (Leipzig, 1914) prepared by W. Bacher, M. Brann, D. Simonsen, and J. Guttmann. A thesis entitled *Notes sur le Judaïsme Libéral de 1750 à 1913* (Montauban, 1914, pp. 146) is by G. Rivals. On the eve of the war S. Wininger published the first section of a *Biographisches Lexikon Berühmter Juden aller Zeiten and Länder* (Czernowitz, 1914, pp. 64), which it is to be hoped he will be able to bring to completion.

The *Bibliothek* of the Prussian Historical Institute in Rome has been enriched by the publication of *Von Nizza bis Crépy: Europäische Politik 1538–1544,* by Dr. Ludwig Cardauns, and of *Ernst August von Hannover und die Katholische Kirche,* by Dr. Philipp Hiltebrandt. A second volume of the latter's *Preussen und die Römische Kurie* is in the press; also the second of Dr. F. Schneider's *Regestum Senense,* the first of Dr. A. Haseloff's *Die Hohenstaufischen Bauten in Süditalien,* and the first of the *Repertorium Germanicum,* ed. E. Göller. Professor Karl Schellhass has practically finished the manuscript of the concluding volume of the *Nuntiaturberichte* of Felician Ninguarda.

Die Litis Contestatio in ihrer Entwicklung vom Frühen Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Zivilprozesses (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914) was written by Dr. Rudolf Sohm the younger.

Recent issues of the series of monographs on church history under the title *Stimmen aus Maria Laach,* include S. Rosch, *Zur Neuern Literatur über Nestorius*; K. Kneller, *Der hl. Cyprian und das Kennzeichen*

der Kirche; S. Sträter, *Die Vertreibung der Jesuiten aus Deutschland im Jahre 1872*; and D. Stöckerl, *Bruder David von Augsburg: ein Deutsche Mystiker aus dem Franziskanerorden.*

Professor G. Seeliger has published a series of facsimiles of *Urkunden und Siegel* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914) for class use. The work is obtainable in four separate parts: the first (pp. 32, 20 plates) contains *Kaiserurkunden,* edited by Professor Seeliger; the second (pp. 40, 16 plates) contains *Papsturkunden,* edited by Professor A. Brackmann; the third (pp. 40, 15 plates) contains *Privaturkunden,* edited by Professor O. Redlich and Dr. L. Gross; and the fourth (pp. 34, 11 plates) contains *Siegel,* edited by Professor F. Philippi. The low price of five marks a part adds to their availability.

The *American Year-Book* for 1914 (Appleton) edited by Francis G. Wickware, contains reviews of events and of progress in the usual wide variety of fields. These are written for the most part by competent specialists and are of great value. Naturally the chief variation from the forms of other volumes consists in the section on the European war.

The Library of Congress has issued its serial *List of Doctoral Dissertations printed in 1913.*

Historical Essays on Apprenticeship and Vocational Education, by Dr. Jonathan F. Scott of the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor Press, 1914, pp. 96), consists partly of chapters from a thesis, well worked out, but of which the remaining chapters were made less necessary by Miss Dunlop's *English Apprenticeship and Child Labour*; and partly of additional but related essays.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Peyre, *Coup d'Oeil sur l'Origine des Villes, sur les Causes de leur Situation, de leur Développement, de leur Transformation, et de leur Décadence* (Revue des Études Historiques, July); J. A. Wilgus, *The Teaching of History in the Elementary School* (Educational Review, February); Frederic Duncalf, *Some Reasons for teaching Social and Economic History in the High School History Courses* (Texas History Teachers' Bulletin, November).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The Schweich Lectures for 1912, delivered by Dr. C. H. W. Johns, dealt with the code of Hammurabi, of which it will be remembered Dr. Johns published an English translation in 1903. The lectures have now been published in a volume entitled *The Relations between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples* (Oxford University Press), with the addition of a valuable preface and bibliography.

A volume of *Babylonische Briefe aus der Zeit der Hammurapi-Dynastie* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914) has been published by A. Ungnad.

In *Lands and Peoples of the Bible* (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1914) Mr. James Baikie endeavors to provide the historical and

geographical background needful for an intelligent study of the Old Testament. The book is divided into three sections, dealing respectively with Palestine, Mesopotamia and Babylonia, and Egypt. The results of the archaeological investigations of the last half-century are summarized in convenient and readable form, and while the book is avowedly written at second hand it is based upon the best authorities, such as Hall, Maspero, Hilprecht, Petrie, Goodspeed, Breasted, and others.

An excellent piece of work is William N. Tarn's *Antigonos Gonatas,* published by the Clarendon Press.

Recent additions to the *Loeb Classical Library* are: vol. III. of Dio's *Roman History,* the English translation by Earnest Cary; two volumes of Plutarch's *Lives,* translated by Bernadotte Perrin; vol. I. of Procopius, translated by H. B. Dewing; vol. II. of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia,* translated by Walter Miller; and Caesar's *Civil Wars,* translated by A. G. Peskett.

Art and Archaeology for February and March has well-illustrated articles on the Roman Theatre, by Professor Charles Knapp of Columbia University.

In the list of doctoral dissertations in history published in our last number, mention might have been made of two Princeton dissertations lately printed, one by Mr. L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions,* and one by Mr. C. W. Keyes, *The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire* (Princeton University Press); of a Princeton dissertation by Mr. C. R. Small, not yet in press, "A History of the Roman Legion VI. Ferrata"; and of one by Mr. R. H. Lacey, "A Study of Certain Roman Officials in the Second Century of our Era".

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: O. Montelius, *När började man allmänt använda Järn?* (Fornvännen, 1913; translated as *Wann begann die Allgemeine Verwendung des Eisens?* Praehistorische Zeitschrift, V.); A. Kohn, *Die Prähistorischen Perioden in Palästina* (Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien, XLIV. 3); P. Waltz, *Les Artisans et leur Vie en Grèce des Temps Homériques à l'Époque Classique: le Siècle de Hésiode* (Revue Historique, September); K. J. Beloch, *Die Schlacht an der Trebia* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIV. 1.); F. F. Abbott, *Referendum and Recall among the Romans* (Sewanee Review, February); H. de La Ville de Mirmont, *Cn. Domitius Corbulo* (Revue Historique, January).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

The period of the early church is covered by Giobbio, *Chiesa e Stato nei Primi Secoli del Cristianesimo, 40–476* (Milan, Cogliati, 1914), and from another point of view by Strathman, *Geschichte der Frühchristlichen Askese bis zur Entstehung des Mönchtums im Religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhange* (vol. I., Leipzig, Deichert, 1914).

Recent biographies of the church fathers include *Clement of Alexandria: a Study in Christian Liberalism* (London, Williams and Norgate, 1914, 2 vols.) by R. B. Tollington; *Das Leben Cyprians von Pontius: die Erste Christliche Biographie Untersucht* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914) by A. Harnack; and *Saint Justin, Philosophe, Martyr* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914) by M. J. Lagrange.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Windisch, *Der Untergang Jerusalems (Anno 70) im Urteil der Christen und Juden* (Theologisch Tijdschrift, XLVIII. 6); A. Jäggli, *Von Konstantin zu Augustinus: Gedanken zur Entstehung der Mittelalterlichen Gottesstaatsidee* (Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift, XXXI. 1, 4).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: L. Bréhier, *Publications relatives à l'Histoire Byzantine* (Revue Historique, September).

Many interesting questions are raised by D. S. Margoliouth in *The Early Development of Mohammedanism*, the Hibbert Lectures for 1913 (Scribner's Sons).

The first part of *Saint Clare of Assisi: her Life and Legislation*, by Ernest Gilliat-Smith (Dent) is comparatively unimportant, as it adds nothing to our knowledge of the life of Saint Clare, but much that is of value is brought out in the latter half of the book, which deals with the rules observed by the Poor Clares.

H. Singer has published *Die Dekretalensammlung des Bernardus Compostellanus Antiquus, mit Benutzung der in Friedrich Maassens Nachlasse enthaltenen Vorarbeiten* (Vienna, Hölder, 1914, pp. 129) in volume 171 of the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy. *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI., und Innocenz VI., 1335–1362* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1914, pp. xvi, 935) has been edited by K. H. Schäfer.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Krammer, *Forschungen zur Lex Salica*, I. (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Aeltere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXXIX. 3); B. von Simson, *Pseudoisidor und die Le Mans-Hypothese* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXV.); H. Fehr, *Das Waffenrecht der Bauern im Mittelalter* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistiche Abteilung, XXXV.), K. Beyerle, *Die Pfleghaften* (*ibid.*); H. Wirtz, *Donum, Investitura, Conductus Ecclesiae: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kirchlichen Stellenbesetzungsrechtes auf Grund Rheinischer Urkunden, vornehmlich des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXV.); H. Mitteis, *Beaumanoir und die Geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Prozessrechts* (*ibid.*).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: E. Driault, *Histoire Extérieure du Premier Empire* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September).

H. Merbach has outlined the age-long struggle between Teuton and Slav in *Die Slavenkriege des Deutschen Volkes* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914) and Dr. F. Quadflieg has discussed *Russische Expansionspolitik, 1774–1914* (Berlin, Dümmler, 1914).

Le Fonds Lorrain aux Archives Impériales et Royales de Vienne (Nancy, Crépin-Leblond, 1913, pp. 52) by M. Dieterlen, which is a reprint from the *Mémoires de la Société d'Archéologie Lorraine,* is the first attempt to give some account of these materials, which were moved to Florence in 1737 and to Vienna in 1765. A recent volume of Lorraine history is *La Vie à la Cour de Lorraine sous le Règne du Duc Henri II., 1608–1624* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914) by H. Roy.

Mr. Francis Abell is the author of a careful work entitled *Prisoners of War in Britain, 1756 to 1815* (Humphrey Milford). A volume of similar interest is *Prisoners of War in France, 1804–1814, being the Adventures of John Tregerthen Short and Thomas Williams of St. Ives, Cornwall,* with an introduction by Sir Edward Hain (Duckworth and Company).

Some side-lights on the treaty of Amiens and its rupture will be found in W. Stroh, *Das Verhältnis zwischen Frankreich und England in den Jahren 1801–1803 im Urteil der Politischen Literatur Deutschlands* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914).

Germany, France, Russia, and Islam, by Heinrich von Treitschke, in English translation, has been published by Jarrold and Sons and Allen and Unwin, as has also *Treitschke: his Life and Works.*

Successive phases of the Eastern Question are treated in E. Peters, *Die Orientpolitik Friedrichs des Grossen nach dem Frieden von Teschen, 1779–1786* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1914), which is a brief thesis; in Professor A. Hasenclever, *Die Orientalische Frage in den Jahren 1838–1841; Ursprung des Meerengenvertrages vom 13. Juli 1841* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1914); and in T. von Sosnosky, *Die Balkanpolitik Oesterreich-Ungarns seit 1866* (vol. II., Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1914, pp. x, 405).

The Cambridge University Press has in preparation *Modern France, 1815–1900,* by W. A. J. Archbold; *Modern Germany,* by J. W. Headlam; and a volume by D. G. Hogarth, *The Levant, 1815–1900.*

Of the *Oxford Pamphlets,* mostly relating to the war, three may be especially useful to those seeking rapid surveys of the most recent European history: *Austrian Policy since 1867,* by Murray Beaven; *Italian Policy since 1870,* by Keith Feiling; *Greek Policy since 1882,* by Arnold J. Toynbee (Oxford University Press).

Volume IV. of John Theodore Merz's *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (Blackwood) deals with the ethical and social problems of the century.

The Macmillan Company is shortly to publish *A History of Persia,* in two volumes, by Lieut.-Col. P. M. Sykes, the author of *Ten Thousand Miles in Persia.*

Le Sultanat d'Oman: Étude d'Histoire Diplomatique et de Droit International, la Question de Muscate (Paris, Pedone, 1914, pp. 273) is a law thesis by Prince Firouz Kajare.

Marc, *Quelques Années de Politique Internationale, Antécédents de la Guerre Russo-Japonaise* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1914), and the third and concluding volume of Freiherr von Maltzahn, *Der Seekrieg zwischen Russland und Japan, 1904 bis 1905* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914, pp. x, 262) are recent additions to the literature of the Russo-Japanese War.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Dürr, *Das Mailändische Kapitulat, Savoyen, und der Burgundisch-Schweizerische Vertrag vom Jahre 1467* (Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde, XIV. 1); J. Calmette, *La Politique Espagnole dans la Crise de l'Indépendance Bretonne, 1488–1492* (Revue Historique, November); L. M. Sears, *Glimpses Economic of the Sixteenth Century* (Sewanee Review, January); W. Platzhoff, *Die Gesandtschaftsberichte Hubert Languets als Historische Quelle und als Spiegel seiner Persönlichkeit* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 3); Comte G. de Mun, *Un Conclave de Six Mois au Milieu du XVIII^e^ Siècle et son Résultat Imprévu; l'Élection de Benoît XIV., Février-Août 1740* (Revue des Deux Mondes, December 1); J. A. R. Marriott, *England and the Low Countries* (Edinburgh Review, January); C. Schmidt, *Anvers et le Système Continental, 1792–1814* (Revue de Paris, February 1); Major G. M. Orr, *The War in Poland and East Prussia, 1806–1807* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, November); Commandant Weil, *Autour du Congrès de Vienne: le Vol de l'Aigle* (Revue de Paris, January 1, 15); B. Schwertfeger, *Vom Wiener Kongress: Briefe des Oberstleutnants von Thile an den Kriegsminister von Boyen während des Kongresses* (Deutsche Rundschau, October, November); A. Malet, *À propos de la Candidature Hohenzollern* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September); C. Benoist, *La Crise de l'État Moderne: le "Mythe" de "la Classe Ouvrière"* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, September); C. Ferraro, *L'Origine Storica delle Fortificazioni dei Dardanelli* (Nuova Antologia, February 1); Captain W. T. Hoadley, U. S. M. C., translator, *Operations around Port Arthur, I.: the Official Version of the Japanese General Staff* (U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, November-December).

THE GREAT WAR

The Library of Congress has issued a *List of References on Europe and International Politics in Relation to the Present Issues* (pp. 144),

compiled under the direction of the chief bibliographer, Mr. H. H. B. Meyer; also, a *List of Publications bearing on the War* has been issued in London as a pamphlet of modest dimensions by the Central Committee for National Patriotic Organizations.

The French "Yellow Book" mentioned in our last number has been issued in English translation by the British government under the title *Diplomatic Correspondence respecting the War, published by the French Government* (Cd. 7717, pp. 194). The American Association for International Conciliation has also issued, as no. 86 of its series *International Conciliation,* and as the fourth of its groups of *Documents regarding the European War,* a pamphlet containing a speech by Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg in the Reichstag, December 2, 1914, and the correspondence, July 24–August 29, 1914, printed in the Belgian "Gray Book"; and as no. 87, a fifth group, the "Yellow Book" above mentioned. No. 85 contained treaties and documents relating to the neutrality of Belgium and Luxemburg, and several official Japanese documents.

A great number of the diplomatic documents of the war, from the German, Russian, Austrian, Belgian, British, and French official books, have been united in a volume edited by M. P. Price, *The Diplomatic History of the War* (imported by Scribner). The *New York Times's* monthly *History* is also an important collection.

One of the most remarkable German publications since the outbreak of the war is *Kriegsaufsätze* (Munich, Bruckmann, 1914, pp. 98), a collection of six articles by Houston S. Chamberlain, the English-born son-in-law of Richard Wagner. W. Klette has collected translations from the writers of the various allied nations and caricatures from their journals, criticizing or ridiculing another of the allied nations, under the title *Unsere Feinde, wie sie einander Lieben* (Munich, Delphin-Verlag, 1914, pp. 187). Under the title of *Privateigentum im Seekriege* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914, pp. xiv, 171) Professor T. Niemeyer published before the war a translation of Lord Loreburn's work, with an introduction which adds to the current interest of the book.

Several series of pamphlets, similar to the *Oxford Pamphlets,* are being published in Germany to popularize information on international questions bearing on the present war. *Deutsche Vorträge Hamburger Professoren* (Hamburg, Friederichsen); *Zwischen Krieg und Frieden* (Leipzig, Hirzel); *Der Deutsche Krieg, Politische Flugschriften,* edited by E. Jäckh (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt); and *Deutsche Reden in Schwerer Zeit* (Berlin, Heymann) are the titles of different series. In France, this campaign of education is being waged by the Comité Michelet, Société d'Éducation Nationale par l'Histoire, which is publishing a monthly *Bulletin Michelet* (Paris, Alcan) at a subscription price of five francs. In a series of *Études et Documents sur la Guerre* (Paris, Colin), E. Durkheim and E. Denis have written *Qui a Voulu la Guerre?,* and Professor J. Bédier has illustrated with facsimiles of the

German originals, chiefly soldiers' diaries, *Les Crimes Allemands d'après des Témoignages Allemands.*

The December issue (XL. 1) of the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* bears the legend "Erstes Kriegsheft", and contains announcement of at least two similar numbers to appear in the near future. These numbers are also to be published separately under the title, *Krieg und Wirtschaft.* The articles included deal with the economic and related problems of the present war. The *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, und Technik* also entitles its October issue (IX. 1) "Erstes Kriegsheft", and contains appropriate articles by Harnack, Eucken, Troeltsch, and others. The October and November numbers of the *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* bear the additional title "Das Neue Deutschland", and the December number, "Das Alte Deutschland", and contain an interesting array of timely articles by leading German historians and other authors.

The second volume of *Guerre de 1914, Documents Officiels, Textes Législatifs et Réglementaires* (Paris, Dalloz, 1915) contains the documents from October 15 to January 1. Several similar publications contain more or less of the same materials arranged for different classes of users. One of the "best sellers" is Léon Daudet, *L'Avant-Guerre: Études et Documents sur l'Espionnage Juif-Allemand en France depuis l'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1914, pp. vi, 312). Gaston Jollivet, *Six Mois de Guerre* (Paris, Hachette, 1915) is but a brief résumé with the familiar documents.

A fortnightly magazine, *La Guerre des Nations,* has been started by Tedesco of Paris, with a foreign subscription rate of 28 francs. In addition to the serial histories of the war mentioned in the previous number, the following are now in course of publication: *Pages Actuelles* (Paris, Bloud and Gay); Émile Hinzelin, *1914: Histoire Illustrée de la Guerre du Droit* (Paris, Quillet); F. Baudouin, *Historique de la Guerre* (Niort, Martin); H. Frobenius, *Deutsche Schwertschrift, Erläuterte Chronik des Ersten Weltkrieges auf Grund von Urkunden und Amtlichen Berichten* (Berlin, Curtius); Professor E. Engel, *1914: ein Tagebuch* (Brunswick, Westermann); and *Der Krieg* (Stuttgart, Franckh). C. H. Baer has published the first volume of *Der Völkerkrieg, eine Chronik der Ereignisse seit dem 1. Juli 1914* (Stuttgart, Hoffmann, 1915, pp. x, 328), which is distinctly better than a mere chronicle.

The most complete study thus far made in America of the diplomatic correspondence published by England, Russia, Belgium, and Germany is *The Evidence in the Case,* by James M. Beck, formerly an assistant attorney-general of the United States (Putnam, pp. 200). Mr. Beck examines the documents from the point of view of a lawyer interested in historical study, in an endeavor to place the immediate moral responsibility for the war. While it is of course impossible to

have access to all the documents requisite for the formulation of a final judgment, so many documents have been made public that an attempt to form a tentative judgment should appear permissible even to the historian. At the time of going to press the French *Yellow Book* had just appeared and Mr. Beck takes cognizance of it in a foot-note. The Austrian *Red Book* has been put out since the publication of Mr. Beck's book.

Among the many books that have appeared on the causes of the war one of the most adequate seems to be *The New Map of Europe* by Herbert Adams Gibbons (Century Company, pp. 412). The volume is primarily a study of the conflict of interests in Africa and the Near East during the last decade, and more especially since 1911. The scope of the work is well indicated by such chapter headings as: Germany in Alsace and Lorraine, The "Weltpolitik" of Germany, Algeciras and Agadir, Italia Irredenta, the Young Turk Régime, Crete and European Diplomacy, the War between the Balkan States and Turkey, the Albanian Fiasco, etc. A residence of some years in Constantinople has enabled Mr. Gibbons to observe much at first hand, indeed has perhaps caused over-emphasis of Balkan affairs. Mr. Gibbons maintains a detached point of view and does not allow the main issues to be lost from sight amid conflicting and varied details.

Kitchener, Organizer of Victory, by Harold Begbie (Houghton Mifflin), is mainly devoted to an effort to present to the English-speaking world the real as contrasted with the "legendary" Kitchener. It is a character sketch of some hundred pages, displayed upon a slight framework of biography and history.

First-hand statements concerning any important episodes of the war, written by eye-witnesses trained in history and having a high position in the historical world, will not be too numerous. It is therefore justifiable to direct particular attention to *A Statement about the Destruction of Louvain and Neighborhood,* by Professor Léon Van der Essen of the University of Louvain, though it is but a privately printed pamphlet of 24 pages (Chicago, 1915).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Hovelaque, *Les Causes Profondes de la Guerre* (Revue du Mois, December); L. Bertrand, *Nietzsche et la Guerre* (Revue des Deux Mondes, December 15); Yves Guyot, *Les Causes de la Guerre,* I.–IV. (Journal des Économistes, August, September, October, November); A. Gauvain, *Les Origines de la Guerre,* I.–III. (Revue de Paris, November 15, December 1, 15); L. Lévy-Bruhl, *Les Causes Économiques et Politiques de la Conflagration Européenne* (Scientia, January); W. J. Ashley, *The Economical Side of the European Conflagration* (*ibid.*); Wilhelm Wundt, *Deutschland im Lichte des Neutralen und des Feindlichen Auslandes* (*ibid.*); E. Daniels, *Zur Genesis des Krieges* (Preussische Jahrbücher, November); *id.*, *Britische Illusionen* (*ibid.*, December); Guglielmo Ferrero, *Le Conflit Européen d'après les Documents Diplomatiques* (Revue des Deux Mondes, Decem-

ber 15); F. L. Baty, *The Neutrality of Belgium* (Quarterly Review, January); L. Renault, *La Guerre et le Droit des Gens au XX^e Siècle* (Revue du Mois, September 10); Oliver Lodge, *The War from a British Point of View* (Scientia, February); G. von Below, *Militarismus und Kultur in Deutschland* (*ibid.*); Dr. Peters, *Unsere Feinde und das Völkerrecht* (Preussische Jahrbücher, January): C. Andler, *Les Usages de la Guerre et la Doctrine de l'État-Major Allemand* (Revue du Mois, November); G. A. di Cesarò, *La Dottrina Tedesca sul Valore dei Trattati Internazionali* (Rassegna Contemporanea, January 20, 30, February 10); E. Altiar, *Journal d'une Française en Allemagne, Juillet-Octobre, 1914* (Revue de Paris, January 15, February 1); A. Séché, *Le Général Joffre* (Revue Hebdomadaire, January 16).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

General review: C. Bémont, *Histoire de Grande Bretagne* (Revue Historique, November).

Two lists important to American historical scholars were added in 1914 by the Public Record Office to its folio series of *Lists and Indexes.* No. XLI. (pp. 208) is a list of the Foreign Office records down to 1837. No. XLIII. (pp. 145) is a list of volumes of state papers relating to Great Britain and Ireland including the Home Office records from 1782 to 1837. Useful dated lists of secretaries of state are prefixed.

At the London Public Record Office, gaps in the series of transcripts from Paris have been filled; and students should take notice that the bundles of these transcripts have been renumbered.

Under the title *Magna Charta Barons and their Descendants* (Philadelphia, 1915), Mr. Charles H. Browning, genealogist of the Baronial Order of Runnemeade, presents a history of Magna Carta based on secondary authorities, its text, a body of biographical sketches of the barons named as sureties, and (the main substance of the book) the pedigrees of various members of this baronial order, to whom alone the book is issued.

The Lincoln Record Society has completed two volumes, *Lincoln Wills, 1271–1526,* ed. C. W. Foster, and the *Rolls of Bishop Hugh de Welles,* vol. III., and has the rolls of Bishops Grosseteste and Lexington and *Visitations of Religious Houses, 1420–1436,* almost ready. Work on *Libri Cleri* and *Final Concords temp. Henry III.* still continues. Volume II. (1599–1638) of the Boston Parish Register is nearing completion, as is also the Register of St. Margaret's, Lincoln (1538–1837). Volumes projected for the near future are *Chapter Acts of Lincoln Cathedral temp. Henry VIII., Accounts of the Nunnery of St. Michaels, Stamford, Visitations of Religious Houses, 1436–1450,* vol. II. of *Lincoln Wills,* and *Domesday and other Early Surveys.*

The Scottish History Society during the year 1914 issued to its members the following books: *Highland Papers,* ed. J. R. N. Macphail; *Selec-*

tions from the Records of the Regality of Melrose, ed. C. S. Romanes; and *Records of the Earldom of Orkney,* ed. J. S. Clouston. Volumes to be issued shortly are: A. Francis Steuart's *The Scots in Poland*; Dr. W. B. Blaikie's *Origins of the '45: Selections from Bailie Steuart's Letter-Book*; *Rentale Dunkeldense*; the second volume of *Warriston's Diary*; the second volume of *Highland Papers*; and *Letters of the Earl of Seafield and others to Godolphin relating to Scotland in the Reign of Queen Anne,* edited by Professor P. Hume Brown.

The National Library of Wales has issued a *Bibliography of Robert Owen the Socialist, 1771–1858* (Aberystwyth, 1914, pp. 54).

The University of Cambridge will soon publish *The Development of Transportation in Modern England,* by Professor W. T. Jackman of the University of Vermont.

Charles Stewart Parnell (Holt), by his brother John Howard Parnell, is an intimate study which throws much light on the character of Parnell.

The South African Year Book, 1914, edited by W. H. Hosking (Dutton) is based on official sources and promises to be a useful annual.

British government publications: *Calendar of State Papers, Venice and Northern Italy,* vol. XX., ed. A. B. Hinds; *Calendar of the Close Rolls,* Richard II., vol. I., 1377–1381, eds. W. H. B. Bird and C. T. Flower.

Other documentary publications: *Diocesis Roffensis Registrum Hamonis Hethe,* pars prima, and *Diocesis Saresbiriensis Registrum Simonis de Gandavo,* pars prima (Canterbury and York Society); *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-First Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A. D. 1184–1185* (Publications of the Pipe Roll Society, vol. XXXIV.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: *The National Records* (Edinburgh Review, October); A. Schulten, *Birrenswark, ein Britannisches Numantia* (Neue Jahrbücher, XXXIII. 9); J. MacNeill, *On the Reconstruction and Date of the Laud Synchronisms* (Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie, X. 1); A. G. von Hamel, *On Lebor Gabála* (Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie, X. 1); T. Taylor, *Evolution of the Diocesan Bishopric from the Monastery Bishoprics of Cornwall* (Revue Celtique, XXXV. 3); C. H. Haskins, *The Reception of Arabic Science in England* (English Historical Review, January); J. F. Willard, *Taxes upon Movables of the Reign of Edward III.* (*ibid.*); G. T. Lapsley, *Archbishop Startford and the Parliamentary Crisis of 1341* (*ibid.*); R. S. Rait, *Parliamentary Representation in Scotland* (Scottish Historical Review, January); Champlin Burrage, *The Antecedents of Quakerism* (English Historical Review, January); Caroline A. J. Skeel, *The Council of the Marches in the Seventeenth Century* (*ibid.*); G. Neilson, *Scotstarvet's "Trew Relation"*, V. (Scottish Historical Review, January); E. Sieper, *Der Kulturwert Englands* (Westermanns Monatshefte, September); Albert Cartwright, *The South African Situation* (Edinburgh Review, January).

FRANCE

General review: R. Reuss, *Histoire de la Révolution* (Revue Historique, January).

An important innovation at the Archives Nationales during the last summer was the setting apart of a catalogue room, where a vast number of manuscript catalogues and inventories, hitherto inaccessible, were placed at the disposal of the public. At the same time the director of the Archives has published an *État des Inventaires des Archives Nationales au 1^er^ Janvier, 1914* (pp. xii, 80), a list of over 800 catalogues, inventories, guides, etc., of different sections of the Archives.

M. Charles Bémont has edited the *Recueil d' Actes relatifs à l'Administration des Rois d'Angleterre en Guyenne au XIII^e^ Siècle* (*Recogniciones Feodorum in Aquitania*) (Paris, Leroux, 1914, pp. lxxv, 481); and A. Longnon, the *Documents relatifs au Comté de Champagne et de Brie, 1172–1361*, t. III., *Les Comptes Administratifs* (*ibid.*, pp. xxix, 678) for the *Collection des Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France.* J. Marx has published a critical edition of the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* of William of Jumièges (Paris, Picard, 1914, pp. xliii, 418) for the Société de l'Histoire de Normandie. L. Halphen and R. Poupardin have published *Chroniques des Comtes d' Anjou et des Seigneurs d'Amboise* (*ibid.*, pp. xcv, 316).

Les Foires de Lyon aux XV^e^ et XVI^e^ Siècles (Paris, Picard, 1914, pp. viii, 386) by M. Brésard; and *Le Métier de la Soie en France, 1466–1815, suivi d'un Historique de la Toile Imprimée, 1759–1815* (Paris, Devambez, 1914, pp. 182) are useful contributions to the economic history of France. To the study of the labor problem produced by the Industrial Revolution, A. Cuvillier has contributed *Un Journal d'Ouvrière, "L'Atelier", 1840–1850* (Paris, Alcan, 1914, pp. 306).

C. Valois has edited for the Société d'Histoire de France an unpublished anonymous contemporary *Histoire de la Ligue* (Paris, Renouard, 1914, pp. xlv, 304) of which the first volume relates to the years 1574–1589. P. de Vaissière's volume of *Récits du Temps des Troubles* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1914) deals with the family of Alègre in the sixteenth century. There is a monograph by E. Pasquier on *Un Curé de Paris pendant les Guerres de Religion, René Benoist, le Pape des Halles, 1521–1608* (Angers, Grassin, 1913, pp. 404), and one by Broqua on *Claude Bernard, dit le Pauvre Prêtre, 1588–1611* (Paris, Lethielleux, 1914, pp. xvi, 272).

L. Loviot has edited a textual reprint of the forerunner of Renaudot's famous journal, *La Gazette de 1609* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914). Two volumes of the *Lettres de la Main de Louis XIII.* (Paris, Rahir, 1914) have been edited by E. Griselle. A volume on *Saint François Régis, Apôtre du Vivarais et du Velay, 1597–1640* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914) is contributed to the series, *Les Saints,* by J. Vianey. A volume of

Mémoires sur le Règne de Louis XIII. (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. ix, 360) by M. de Chizay is another recent publication on the history of that reign.

The interesting military adventurer and writer, *Le Chevalier de Folard, 1669–1752* (Paris, Hachette, 1914) is the subject of a biographical sketch by C. de Coynart. The better known but no more important military adventurer, *Der Baron von Besenval, 1721–1791* (Zürich, Leemann and Company, 1914) is the subject of a biography by O. Schmid. P. Fould has used new documents for *Un Diplomate au Dix-Huitième Siècle, Louis-Augustin Blondel* (Paris, Plon, 1914).

Abbé E. Audard's valuable article on *L'Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution Française aux Archives Vaticanes* (Paris, Letouzey and Ané, 1914, pp. 38) has been reprinted from the *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France.*

Selma Stern has written a life of *Anacharsis Cloots, der Redner des Menschengeschlechts* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914).

Pour l'Empereur (Paris, Ollendorff, 1914, pp. xviii, 402), by Frédéric Masson, is a collection of historical articles which he has published in the *Gaulois,* the *Écho de Paris,* and other papers during the past five years. Among the number is one on the Americans in the Mediterranean from 1786 to 1815, showing the relations with the Barbary States; another deals with the introduction of the beet-sugar industry in France. While all of the papers relate to the Napoleonic period, most of them have to do with the years 1812–1814.

Kegan Paul and Company are the publishers of Captain A. F. Becke's *Napoleon and Waterloo,* two volumes of substantial merit.

Captain F. W. O. Maycock has added to the *Special Campaign* series an excellent volume on *Invasion of France, 1814,* which is published by Messrs. Allen and Unwin.

A half-dozen phases of the Restoration period are revealed in the following books: Gaschet, *Paul Louis Courier et la Restauration* (Paris, Hachette, 1914); Viscount A. de Courson, *Souvenirs d'un Officier de Gendarmerie sous la Restauration* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. xi, 317); Captain L. Blaison, *Une Ville de Garnison sous la Restauration, le Complot de Belfort, 1822* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914, pp. 116); J. L. Borgerhoff, of Western Reserve University, *Le Théâtre Anglais à Paris sous la Restauration* (Paris, Hachette, 1913, pp. xi, 249); P. de Joinville, *Le Réveil Économique de Bordeaux sous la Restauration; l'Armateur Balguerie-Stuttenberg et son Oeuvre* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. xxiii, 485); and E. Jacquemont, *François Jacquemont, Curé de Saint-Médard-en-Forez, 1757–1835* (Lyons, Lardanchet, 1914, pp. xv, 496).

John C. Tarver and E. Sparvel-Bayly are the translators of Gabriel Hanotaux's *Contemporary France,* published by Messrs. Putnam, in four volumes.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Funck-Brentano, *Les Villes en France au Début de l'Époque Féodale* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, November); Irene M. Rope, *The Letters of Jeanne d'Arc* (Dublin Review, January); J. Nouaillac, *La Retraite de Pomponne de Bellièvre, September 1588–Mai 1593* (Revue Historique, November); L. Batiffol, *Un Duel à la Place Royale* [Montmorency-Bouteville] (Revue Hebdomadaire, January 9); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Les Journées de Barfleur et de la Hougue, 29 Mai–3 Juin 1692* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, November); L. Cahen, *La Répartition des Métiers à Paris au Milieu du XVIII^e Siècle* (*ibid.*); J. Larribau, *Lettres de Jean Dulimbert, Officier de Chasseurs, 1804–1815* (Revue de Paris, November 15, December 1, 15); Florence Kinloch-Cooke, *Letters from Paris and Soissons a Hundred Years Ago,* II. (Nineteenth Century, January); V. Masuyer, *La Reine Hortense et le Prince Louis,* I.–IV. (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1, 15, October 1, November 15); H. Plehn, *Die Methoden der Französischen Politik bei der Erwerbung Tunesiens* (Zeitschrift für Politik, VII. 1); A. London, *Die Selbstverwaltung in Frankreich* (*ibid.*).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

G. Manacorda has issued two volumes, on the Middle Ages, of a *Storia della Scuola in Italia* (Palermo, Sandron, 1914, pp. xii, 280, 430).

The fourteenth century is covered in the second volume of R. Gaggese, *Firenze dalla Decadenza di Roma al Risorgimento d'Italia* (Florence, Seeber, 1913, pp. 521). The chronicle of the fourteenth-century Florentine, Donato Velluti, has been edited from the original manuscripts by I. del Lungo and G. Volpi, with the title, *La Cronica Domestica scritta fra il 1367 a il 1370, con le Addizioni di Paolo Velluti scritte fra il 1555 a il 1560* (Florence, Sansoni, pp. xlvii, 358).

Napoleonic Italy is studied in A. Pingaud, *Notices et Documents sur l'Histoire de la République Italienne, 1802–1805* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. 236). Caso, *La Carboneria di Capitanata dal 1816 al 1820* (Naples, Pierro, 1914) relates to the restoration period. On the revolutionary movement of 1848 the more recent publications include G. Capasso, *Dandolo, Morosini, Manara e il Primo Battaglione dei Bersaglieri Lombardi nel 1848–1849* (Milan, Cogliati, 1914, pp. 295); M. degli Alberti, *Alcuni Episodi della Guerra nel Veneto, ossia Diario del Generale Alberto della Marmora dal 26 Marzo al 20 Ottobre 1848* (Rome, 1914, pp. xii, 343); and I. Ghisalberti, *Le Condizioni Generali del Napoletano e gli Avvenimenti del 1848 in Terra d'Otranto, ricostruiti sui Processi Politici* (Martina Franca, Aquaro e Dragonetti, 1914, pp. x, 124).

A royal commission has been appointed to publish the writings of Cavour, which it is estimated will fill twenty-five volumes in addition to his parliamentary speeches, which will appear in a separate series. The

commission plans to publish first the correspondence for the years 1856 to 1860, of which they have already compiled much that has not previously appeared in print.

Felice Orsini (Milan, Cogliati, 1914) by A. Luzio; and *Crispi* (Florence, Barbèra, 1914, pp. xliii, 294) by G. Castellini are among the recent biographies of personages of the Risorgimento.

The latest addition to the list of Italian provincial historical periodicals is the quarterly *Archivio Pugliese del Risorgimento Italiano,* edited by Dr. G. Maselli-Campagna and published at Bari.

The following titles are worth adding to the list of volumes on the Italo-Turkish War: "Un Témoin", *Histoire de la Guerre Italo-Turque* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1913, pp. vii, 135); G. B. Casoni, *La Guerra Italo-Turca* (Florence, Bemporad, 1914, pp. xi, 275); and B. Melli, *La Guerra Italo-Turca* (Rome, Voghera, 1914, pp. viii, 262).

From the beginning of 1915 the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla,* by which one may follow the activities of the Archives of the Indies, of the institute of historical research organized from among its personnel, and of foreign scholars working in Seville, becomes a monthly journal. During the past winter the investigators from the United States working there have been Mr. W. L. Schurz, fellow of the University of California, Mrs. Fanny R. Bandelier, and Miss Irene A. Wright, working respectively in the history of California, of the Pueblo Indians, and of Cuba.

The publication of the proceedings of the *Cortes de los Antiguos Reinos de Aragón y de Valencia y Principado de Cataluña* by the Royal Academy of History has reached the twentieth volume, which contains the proceedings of the Cortes of Catalonia from 1436 to 1440 (Madrid, 1914).

An historical and critical study of the question of *La Unión Ibérica* (Madrid, Velasco, 1914, pp. 366) is by J. del Nido y Segalerva. *Les Étapes de la Royauté d'Alphonse XIII.* (Paris, Perrin, 1914, pp. 301), by R. Meynadier, presents a gloomy picture of Spanish conditions.

The rise and decline of the House of Braganza is the subject of a recent work by Francis Gribble entitled *The Royal House of Portugal* (London, Eveleigh Nash).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Falco, *Il Comune di Velletri nel Medio Evo,* II.–III. (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXVII. 1, 3); F. Ermini, *La Scuola in Italia nel Medio Evo* (Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali e Discipline Ausiliarie, January); Robert Davidsohn, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Manfreds* (Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven, XVII. 1); R. de Cesare, *Emilio Visconti Venosta, Storia e Ricordi* (Nuova Antologia, January 1); M. Hume, *Las Reinas de la España Antigua, Isabel de Borbón,*

Mariana de Austria (La España Moderna, November, December); C. Cambronero, *La Reina Gobernadora, Crónicas Políticas de 1833 à 1840* [conclusion] (*ibid.*, December).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General review: K. Hampe, *Neuere Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte in der Zeit der Ottonen und Salier* (Deutsche Literaturzeitung, November 28, December 5).

E. Rosenstock, *Könighaus und Stämme in Deutschland zwischen 911 und 1250* (Leipzig, Meiner, 1914); Buchner, *Die Deutschen Königswahlen und das Herzogtum Bayern vom Beginn des 10. bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Breslau, Marcus, 1914); and K. G. Hugelmann, *Die Wahl Konrads IV. zu Wien im Jahre 1237* (Weimar, Böhlau, 1914) are recent contributions to the history of the Holy Roman emperors and their election.

The history of the German ecclesiastical states has received the following contributions: Feierabend, *Die Politische Stellung der Deutschen Reichsabteien während des Investiturstreites* (Breslau, Marcus, 1914); Dauch, *Die Bischofsstadt als Residenz der Geistlichen Fürsten* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914); and K. Hofmann, *Die Engere Immunität in Deutschen Bischofsstädten im Mittelalter* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1914, pp. xii, 154), a publication of the Görres-Gesellschaft.

Weinhandel und Wirtsgewerbe im Mittelalterlichen Strassburg (Strassburg, Heitz, 1914, pp. viii, 102) by E. Bender; and A. Jürgens, *Zur Schleswig-Holsteinischen Handelsgeschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, Curtius, 1914, pp. xviii, 315) in the *Abhandlungen zur Verkehrs- und Seegeschichte* are useful recent contributions to German economic history.

A chapter of German military history of the latter half of the fifteenth century is told by M. Nell in *Die Landsknechte, Entstehung der ersten Deutschen Infanterie* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914), which is published as number 123 of the *Historische Studien.*

Germany and the Empire, 1493–1792, by A. F. Pollard, is in preparation at the Cambridge University Press.

The ecclesiastical side of the German enlightenment in the eighteenth century has been studied in R. Lote, *Du Christianisme au Germanisme: l'Évolution Religieuse au XVIII^e Siècle et la Déviation de l'Idéal Moderne en Allemagne* (Paris, 1914); and in J. Rössler, *Die Kirchliche Aufklärung unter dem Spcierer Fürstbischof August von Limburg-Stirum, 1770–1797* (Speier, Gilardone, 1914, pp. 160).

Prussian history in the Napoleonic period has been enriched by the following volumes: Pflugk-Harttung, *Der Stadt- und Polizeipräsident von Tilly und die Zustände in Warschau zur Preussischen Zeit, 1799–*

1806 (Danzig, Kafemann, 1914); Lionnet, *Die Erhebungspläne Preussischer Patrioten, Ende 1806 und Frühjahr 1807* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914); R. Lobetal, *Verwaltung und Finanzpolitik in Preussen während der Jahre 1808–1810* (Berlin, 1914); W. Erman, *Jean Pierre Erman, 1735–1814: ein Lebensbild aus der Berliner Französischen Kolonie* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914); and H. Klaje, *Pommern im Jahre 1813* (Colberg, Dietz and Maxerath, 1914).

The first volume of a new *Geschichte der Befreiungskriege, 1813 und 1814* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1914) by Heinrich Ulmann is among the new publications.

Several phases of the constitutional development of Prussia in the nineteenth century have been studied in Stephan, *Die Entstehung der Provinzialstände in Preussen, 1823* (Berlin, Louys, 1914); E. Jordan, *Die Entstehung der Konservativen Partei und die Preussischen Agrarverhältnisse von 1848* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914); F. Löwenthal, *Der Preussische Verfassungsstreit, 1862–1866* (*ibid.*, pp. xi, 342); and Professor E. Loening, *Gerichte und Verwaltungsbehörden in Brandenburg-Preussen: ein Beitrag zur Preussischen Rechts- und Verfassungsgeschichte* (Halle, Waisenhaus, 1914, pp. xiii, 326).

H. Kohl has edited the *Briefe Ottos von Bismarck an Schwester und Schwager, Malvine von Arnim, geb. v. Bismarck, und Oskar von Arnim-Kröhlendorff, 1843–1897* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914). A life of *Fürst Bismarcks Frau* (Berlin, Trowitzsch, 1914, pp. viii, 251) is by Sophie Charlotte von Sell. R. Pahncke has prepared a critical study of *Die Parallelerzählungen Bismarcks zu seinen Gedanken und Erinnerungen* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1914). The studies of *Die Eisenbahnpolitik des Fürsten Bismarck* (Berlin, Springer, 1914) by Dr. A. von der Leyen, and of *Bismarck und das Kriegsvölkerrecht* (Leipzig, Gräfe, 1914) by W. D. Geisberg have a timely interest. Paul Matter has revised his three volumes on *Bismarck et son Temps* (Paris, Alcan, 1914).

Mr. H. W. C. Davis of Balliol College, in a book on *The Political Thought of Heinrich von Treitschke* (imported by Scribner), gives an account of the early life of that historian and his relations with Bismarck, and an exposition of his political philosophy.

In the series *Württembergische Geschichtsquellen* issued by the Württemberg Historical Commission there have recently appeared the second volume of A. Hauber, *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Heiligkreuztal*; the first volume of H. Günter, *Gerwig Blarer, Abt von Weingarten, 1520–1567, Briefe und Akten*; and the first volume, dealing with Leutkirch and Isny, of K. O. Müller, *Oberschwäbische Stadtrechte* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1913, 1914). The latest issue in the series of *Darstellungen aus der Württembergischen Geschichte*, published under the same auspices, is C. Albrecht, *Die Triaspolitik des Freiherrn K. Aug. von Wangenheim.*

Dr. Henryk Grossman, in *Oesterreichs Handelspolitik mit Bezug auf Galizien in der Reformperiode, 1772–1790* (Vienna, Konegen, 1914, pp. xvii, 510) studies with an open mind, after careful researches, the economic reforms instituted by Joseph II. after the acquisition of Austrian Poland.

J. Slokar has published a history of the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution in Austria under the title *Geschichte der Oesterreichischen Industrie und ihrer Förderung unter Kaiser Franz I.* (Vienna, Tempsky, 1914).

The third volume of Widmann's *Geschichte Salzburgs* (Gotha, Perthes, 1914) carries the narrative from 1519 to 1805.

Rev. W. A. B. Coolidge is the author of *Switzerland since 1499,* soon to be issued by the Cambridge University Press.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Stäbler, *Zum Streit um die Aeltere Deutsche Markgenossenschaft* (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Aeltere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXXIX. 3); J. Haller, *Kaiser Heinrich VI.* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 3); M. Rade, *Der Sprung in Luthers Kirchenbegriff und die Entstehung der Landeskirche* (Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XXIV. 5); Robert West, *Der Dreissigjährige Krieg und die Kunst* (Preussische Jahrbücher, January); K. Kormann, *Die Landeshoheit in ihrem Verhältnis zur Reichsgewalt im Alten Deutschen Reich seit dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Zeitschrift für Politik, VII. 1); K. T. Heigel, *Benjamin Thompson, Graf von Rumford* (Westermanns Monatshefte, December); G. Ritter, *Die Entstehung der Indemnitätsvorlage von 1866* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIV. 1).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The latest published report from the Dutch Archives (but a report prepared before the outbreak of the war) indicated that the Historical Commission then expected to issue in 1915 the seventh part of Dr. Colenbrander's *Gedenkstukken,* embracing diplomatic and political papers of the important period from the recognition of William I. as Sovereign Prince to his recognition as King of the Netherlands, November, 1813–September, 1815; of the fifth part, extending from 1673–1676, of the *Acta der Particuliere Synoden van Zuid-Holland*; and of the first volume, the volume for 1576, ed. Japikse, of the *Resolutien der Staten-Generaal van 1576 tot 1609.*

The Netherlands since 1477 is the title of a volume by Rev. George Edmundson, soon to be issued by the Cambridge University Press.

The Linschotenvereeniging has published as its eighth volume the voyages of Jan Huygen van Linschoten to the northward in 1594–1595, edited by S. P. L'Honoré Naber.

G. M. Reyntjes is the author of a thesis on *Groningen en Ommelanden van 1580 tot 1594* (Groningen, Werkman, 1914, pp. xxv, 204, iv).

In commemoration of its three hundredth anniversary, the University of Groningen has published *Academia Groningana, MDCXIV.–MCMXIV.* (Groningen, Noordhoff, 1914, pp. 604).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

H. Franzén presented as his thesis at Upsala, *Representationsfrågan, 1810–1830, ett Bidrag till Representationsreformens Historia* (Norrköping, 1914, pp. xvi, 196), which relates chiefly to the problem in Sweden.

In addition to the annual volume of *Transactions* reviewed on another page, the Royal Historical Society has issued a chronicle of Russia in the Middle Ages, a translation of the *Novgorod Chronicle* (1016–1472), by Robert Mitchell and Nevill Forbes, with an introduction by Professors C. R. Beazley and A. A. Shakhmatov.

A presentation volume in honor of Professor Dmitry Korsakov of the University of Kazan (Kazan, 1913) contains some excellent essays on Russian history, among which is one by D. Zapolski on the economic and social conditions in 1812, indicating the probability that Napoleon might have appealed successfully for a rising of the serfs. Later conditions are the subject of volumes by P. Marc, *Au Seuil du 17 Octobre 1905, Historique du Mouvement des Esprits en Russie de 1899 au 17 Octobre 1905* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1914, pp. 146); and by W. O. Preyer on *Die Russische Agrarreform* (Jena, Fischer, 1914, pp. xiv, 415).

An account of the *Origine ed Evoluzione Storica delle Nazioni Balcaniche* (Milan, Hoepli, 1915, pp. 628) is by Angelo Pernice.

A *Geschichte von Montenegro und Albanien* (Gotha, Perthes, 1914) has been published by S. Gopčevič. Professor M. J. Bonn has issued *Die Balkanfrage* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914) which contains ten articles mostly by German professors on phases of the present situation in the Balkan peninsula. Another recent volume is Rohde, *Die Ereignisse zur See und das Zusammenwirken von Heer und Flotte im Balkankrieg* (Berlin, Eisenschmidt, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. E. Lingelbach, *Geography in Russian History* (Popular Science Monthly, January).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

E. J. Rapson is the author of *Ancient India from the Earliest Times to the First Century A. D.* (Cambridge University Press), a concise summary of information.

W. Reese has collected in a small volume *Die Griechischen Nachrichten über Indien bis zum Feldzuge Alexanders des Grossen* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914).

British India, 1603–1858, by Sir G. W. Forrest, director of records under the Indian government, is soon to be issued by the Cambridge University Press.

A History of the Indian Medical Service, 1600–1913, by Lieut.-Col. D. G. Crawford (Calcutta, Thacker, 2 vols.), presents an impressive array of facts, some of which have already appeared in the *Indian Medical Gazette.*

While administering the French establishments in India in 1911, A. Martineau founded the Société de l'Histoire de l'Inde Française, which has issued the following publications: *Procès-Verbaux des Délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Compagnie des Indes de 1701 à 1735* (Pondicherry, 1913–1914, 2 vols.); *Lettres et Conventions des Gouverneurs de Pondichéry avec Différents Princes Hindous, 1666 à 1793* (*ibid.,* 1914); and *Inventaire des Anciennes Archives de l'Inde Française* (*ibid.,* pp. 38), which unfortunately deals only with the political and administrative documents.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Pérez, *Historia de las Misiones de los Franciscanos en las Islas Malucas y Célebes,* III., IV., V. [conclusion] (Archivum Franciscanum Historicum, April, July, October); Miss M. E. Monckton Jones, *Free and Open Trade in Bengal* (English Historical Review, January).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The *Report* of the Librarian of Congress for the year ending June 30, 1914, is of interest to historical students particularly for its account of the historical manuscripts acquired by the Library during the year. Principal among these are: the papers of Edmund Roberts (1784–1836), of value for the Far Eastern relations of the United States; the papers of Alexander Dallas Bache, superintendent of the coast survey from 1843 to 1867; the papers of Major-General C. B. Comstock, senior aide-de-camp to General Grant, 1864–1865; a transcript of the shorthand notes of Col. G. W. Moore, private secretary to President Johnson (1866–1868); letters (1835–1847) of John Fairfield, governor of Maine, representative in Congress and senator, illuminating social life in Washington; the papers of Thomas Ewing, United States senator, Secretary of the Treasury and of the Interior; papers of the Mercy-Argenteau family of Belgium (1460–1880), aggregating about ten thousand documents; the N. P. Trist papers; several volumes of journals and miscellaneous papers of Luis Berlandier, the scientific explorer; some two hundred letters of Francis Lieber; and additions to the Welles, Biddle, and other papers. The library has also made considerable additions to its collection of eighteenth-century newspapers.

The Library of Congress has issued vol. III. of the *List of Geographical Atlases* in the library, with bibliographical notes, compiled under the direction of P. Lee Phillips. The Division of Manuscripts has nearly ready for publication a handbook giving an account of all its collections.

Houghton Mifflin Company are bringing out a four-volume *History of the United States,* comprising *Beginnings of American Life,* by Carl Becker (vol. I.), *Union and Democracy,* by Allen Johnson (vol. II.), *Expansion and Conflict,* by W. E. Dodd (vol. III.), and *The New Nation,* by F. L. Paxson (vol. IV.).

Miss Eva Alice Cole of Columbia University Library contributes to the January number of the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* a useful Check List of Biographical Directories and General Catalogues of American Colleges.

The July issue of the *Magazine of History* contains an article, the Unifying of the Thirteen States, by Charles N. Holmes, some letters of Washington, John Adams, Francis Lightfoot Lee, and General Sherman, and continuations of Colonel Robert Gould Shaw's letters (1861) and of the War Time Recollections of Captain Asa N. Hays (further continued in the October–November number). The August–September number includes a paper, the Volunteer Navy of the Revolution, by Rear-Admiral C. M. Chester, the concluding installment of R. S. Guernsey's paper, Religious Liberty in Colonial New York, an article by J. E. Oster on Diplomatic and Treaty Relations between the United States and Mexico, and a continuation of Colonel LeGrand B. Cannon's Personal Reminiscences of the Rebellion. Mr. Holmes also writes for the October–November number on the Presidential Election of 1800.

True Stories of Great Americans is the general title of a new series of biographies announced by Macmillan. The purpose of the series is "to tell simply and attractively the life stories of Americans who have achieved greatness in different fields of endeavor". The volumes promised for early issue are: *Robert E. Lee,* by Bradley Gilman; *Captain John Smith,* by Rossiter Johnson; *Benjamin Franklin,* by E. Lawrence Dudley; and *Robert Fulton,* by Alice C. Sutcliffe.

A History of Travel in America, by Seymour Dunbar, in four volumes with elaborate illustrations, has just issued from the press of the Bobbs-Merrill Company.

American Chambers of Commerce (pp. xiii, 278), by Kenneth Sturges, is no. 4 of the Williams College David A. Wells Prize Essays. After pointing out the origins of chambers of commerce and boards of trade in the medieval fairs and merchant gilds, the beginnings and development of such organizations in the United States are traced. Something more than one-fourth of the book is occupied with this historical investigation. The oldest commercial organization in this country, that of

the New York Chamber of Commerce, dates from 1768, and only three others (New Haven, Charleston, and Philadelphia) existed in 1801. The development of these commercial organizations during the nineteenth century, under whatever name and form, is traced in a rapid sketch, followed by a fuller account of the federation movement of recent years, culminating in the formation, in 1912, of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America. The author sets forth somewhat elaborately the structural principles of chambers of commerce and describes their activities and achievements.

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge has gathered a number of his recent addresses and papers into a volume to which is given the title *The Democracy of the Constitution; and other Addresses and Essays.* The volume includes the Constitution and its Makers, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the Public Opinion Bill, the Compulsory Initiative and Referendum and the Recall of Judges, and essays on Lincoln, Calhoun, and Thomas B. Reed, etc.

The Doctrine of Judicial Review: its Legal and Historical Basis and other Essays, by Professor Edward S. Corwin, includes "Marbury *v.* Madison and the Doctrine of Judicial Review", "We, the People", "The Pelatiah Webster Myth", and "The Dred Scott Decision".

The Yale University Press will publish *Undercurrents in American Politics,* by President Arthur T. Hadley.

The latest issue in the series of *Harvard Economic Studies* is *The Anthracite Coal Combination in the United States,* by Dr. Eliot Jones of Iowa State University, which contains also some account of the early development of the anthracite industry.

Compiled Statutes of the United States, embracing the Statutes of the United States of a General and Permanent Nature in Force December 31, 1913, in five volumes, compiled by John A. Mallory, has been brought out in St. Paul by the West Publishing Company.

The increasing use of pageantry in presenting the history of this country is attractively set forth by means of text and of numerous illustrations in Ralph Davol's *A Handbook of American Pageantry,* published by the Davol Publishing Company, Taunton, Mass.

A good deal of useful information respecting negro history is to be found in the historical sections of the *Negro Year Book,* edited by Monroe N. Work and published at Tuskegee, Alabama.

Mr. Preston A. Barba of Indiana University contributes to the November–December issue of the *German American Annals* an interesting paper respecting Emigration to America reflected in German Fiction.

Dr. John Finley's *The French in the Heart of America,* based on a series of articles in *Scribner's Magazine,* has just been brought out as a book by Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Huguenot, Bartholomew Dupuy, and his Descendants, by B. H. Dupuy, is published by the author (Leesburg, Florida).

With the December number, which completes its twentieth volume, the *Catholic University Bulletin* "brings to a close its career as a university publication of miscellaneous content", and becomes simply a bulletin of university news. It is proposed to establish a new magazine devoted to the study of American Catholic ecclesiastical history, to be called the *Catholic Historical Review* and to be issued quarterly. It is expected that the first number of this quarterly may be issued this month.

The principal content of the December number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* is the continuation of the late Martin I. J. Griffin's Life of Bishop Conwell. There is a brief paper, by Rev. Felix Fellner, O.S.B., concerning the Rev. Theodore Brouwers, O.F.M., missionary in the West Indies and pioneer priest in Western Pennsylvania, and also a translation, from a broadside in the Library of Congress, of an "Extrait des Registres des Audiences du Conseil Supérieur de la Province de la Louisiane", May 7, 1765.

The American Jewish Historical Society held its twenty-third annual meeting on February 21 and 22. Among the papers read we note the following: on the medieval status of the Jew, by Dr. Joseph Jacobs; on the economic condition of the Jews of Spain, by Rev. Dr. Abraham Neuman; on a letter of David Nassy of Surinam, by Samuel Oppenheim; on Daniel Gomez, pioneer merchant in early New York, by Leon Hühner; on the naturalization of English Jews by the act of 1753, by Dr. Albert C. Dudley; on references of Jewish interest in the newspapers of the Revolution, 1761–1789, by Dr. Harold Korn; on the history of the Hebrew periodical press in America, by Joshua Bloch.

The *Publications,* no. 22, of the American Jewish Historical Society (pp. 286) includes records of the twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-second annual meetings (1912, 1913, and 1914). The more important historical papers in the volume are: an account of Judah Monis, by L. M. Friedman; David Nassy of Surinam and his "Lettre Politico-Théologico-Morale sur les Juifs", by Sigmund Seeligmann; Some Phases of the Condition of the Jews in Spain in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, by Rabbi A. A. Neuman; the correspondence of the Jews with President Martin Van Buren, contributed, from the Van Buren Papers in the Library of Congress, by A. M. Friedenberg; America in Hebrew Literature, by Rev. Mendel Silber; Jews in the Legal and Medical Professions in America prior to 1800, by Leon Hühner; and some Notes on American Jewish History, by Rev. D. de Sola Pool.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America has in preparation a volume of hitherto unpublished narratives of travel in the

colonies in the eighteenth century, which will be edited by Dr. Newton D. Mereness. The contents embrace narratives by colonial, English, French, and German travellers and extend over a wide range of the colonial area, settled and unsettled.

The Presidents of the United States, 1789–1914, in four volumes, edited by the late Gen. James Grant Wilson, has come from the press (Scribner).

The Political Science of John Adams: a Study in the Theory of Mixed Government and the Bicameral System, by C. M. Walsh, has been published by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

One Aspect of the Century of Peace (Napanee, Ontario, the *Beaver* Office) is an address delivered in February of this year by Clarance M. Warner, president of the Ontario Historical Society, before the Elgin Historical and Scientific Institute, St. Thomas, Ontario. The principal purpose of the paper is to show why the English-speaking people did not celebrate the twenty-fifth, fiftieth, or seventy-fifth anniversary of peace between the United States and Great Britain.

The centenary of the battle of New Orleans and the completion of one hundred years of peace between Great Britain and the United States were commemorated with suitable ceremonies in the city of New Orleans and on the battlefield on January 8, 9, and 10 under the auspices of the Louisiana Historical Society.

The Carnegie Institution of Washington is about to issue in three parts an *Index to United States Documents relating to Foreign Affairs, 1828–1861,* that is, from the conclusion of the Foreign Relations section of the folio *American State Papers* to the beginning of the State Department's annual series. The compilation is edited by Miss Adelaide R. Hasse of the New York Public Library.

The Senate, October 21, adopted a resolution to reprint as a Senate document the pamphlet account of Col. Doniphan's Conquest of New Mexico in 1846–1847, by John T. Hughes, a member of the First Missouri Cavalry, Doniphan's command. The reprint is 63 Cong., 2 sess., *Senate Document No. 608.*

The Story of Wendell Phillips, Soldier of the Common Good, by Charles Edward Russell, makes the career of Wendell Phillips particularly significant for its opposition to social privilege.

Lee's Confidential Despatches to Davis, 1862–1865, edited by Douglas S. Freeman, will be published shortly by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The Journal of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, 39 Cong., 1 and 2 sess., which was not printed until 1884, and of which few copies appear to be in existence (see the REVIEW, XVI. 209), has been reprinted (63 Cong., 3 sess., *Senate Doc. No. 711,* pp. 53).

For the medical history of the Civil War the *Personal Memoirs of John H. Brinton, Major and Surgeon, U. S. V., 1861–1865* (Neale) is a work of value. An introduction to the book is from the pen of the late Dr. S. Weir Mitchell.

A History of the Civil War in the United States, by Vernon Blythe, is published by Neale.

In her book *Abraham Lincoln* Miss Rose Strunsky aims to present Lincoln, not as "The Great Liberator", by as "the apostle of true democracy", the embodiment of "the gaunt, crude, virile America of the free lands", "part and parcel of his class, the small homesteader who claimed an equal opportunity in the virgin forests", the epitome of the dominant forces in a stage of the country's history from which the great present grew (Macmillan).

Houghton Mifflin Company have brought out *The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes,* in two volumes, by C. R. Williams.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

The Town of St. Johnsbury, Vermont: a Review of One Hundred and Twenty-five Years to the Anniversary Pageant, 1912, by E. T. Fairbanks, is published in St. Johnsbury by the Cowles Press.

In the November serial of the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Proceedings* the principal paper is by Mr. Lincoln N. Kinnicutt on the Plymouth Settlement and Tisquantum. A paper by Mr. Charles Francis Adams draws an interesting comparison between the campaign in progress in France and Belgium and that in Virginia in 1864. The paper is discussed by Col. Thomas L. Livermore and Col. W. R. Livermore. There is a letter of Sir Henry Clinton to Lord Rawdon, June 25, 1775, one from General Burgoyne to Lord North, October 10, 1775, and one from Edmund Burke to an unidentified correspondent, December 1, 1793.

The *Twenty-Seventh Report* (1914) of the Massachusetts commissioner of public records notes the publication of a volume of *Old Records of the Town of Fitchburg, Massachusetts,* and of an *Index to the Probate Records of the County of Middlesex, Massachusetts,* first series, 1648–1871. The second series (1870–1910) was published in 1912. Vital records to 1850 of the following towns have been printed: Abington (vols. I. and II.), Brockton, Dunstable, Kingston, Reading, Tewksbury, Wakefield, and West Bridgewater.

The *Essex Institute Historical Collections* for January includes an initial paper, by G. A. Moriarty, jr., entitled "The Governor of New Providence, West Indies, in 1702: the Administration of Governor Elias Hasket of Salem in the Massachusetts Bay".

Soldiers of Oakham, Massachusetts, in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, and the Civil War, by Henry P. Wright (New Haven, the

Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor Company, pp. x, 325), is a military record of some interest, in that it shows how our three principal wars have affected one small community. The book includes biographical sketches of more than 300 soldiers, besides a good deal of genealogical material. Out of a community, having a population in 1776 of 598, an even 200 are set down as having in one way or another served in the Revolutionary War. The Civil War soldiers whose records are given in the volume number 97 (the population in 1860 was 959), although 34 of these are connected with Oakham on other grounds than enlistment. In the War of 1812 Oakham does not loom so large. Not until Massachusetts was threatened with invasion were there any enlistments from the town, and then fourteen men served for a bare six weeks.

The January number of *Americana* contains a first installment of an extended study, "Rhode Island Settlers on the French Lands in Nova Scotia in 1760 and 1761", by A. W. H. Eaton.

In an attractive book of ninety-seven pages, *The John Carter Brown Library, a History,* Mr. George P. Winship, librarian of the collection since 1895, describes in a most interesting manner the development of the collection in the hands of John Carter Brown, of his widow, and of his son John Nicholas Brown, the building in which it has been housed since it was bestowed upon Brown University, and the work of recent years in increasing and perfecting it, and making it useful to the public and to scholars.

Dr. Samuel Hart, dean of the Berkeley Divinity School in Connecticut, has issued a little pamphlet containing two articles reprinted from the *Connecticut Churchman* of October and December, 1914, on *The Episcopal Bank and the Bishop's Fund* (pp. 16), which recount some unique facts of Connecticut history, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of Hartford banking.

Connecticut Vital Records: Woodstock, 1686–1854, a companion work to the *Bolton-Vernon Vital Records,* and the *Norwich Vital Records,* has appeared (Hartford, the Case, Lockwood, and Brainard Company).

The New York State Historical Association has about ready for the press the volume of its *Proceedings* for the year 1913.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have issued *A History of Old Kinderhook,* by E. A. Collier.

The Oldest Lutheran Church in America, 1664–1914 (pp. 48), by Karl Kretzmann, is a brief history of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of St. Matthew in the city of New York, extracted from a much larger work which has for some time been in preparation (the History Committee, 419 West 145th Street, New York). There are numerous illustrations.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has received from Miss Letitia A. Humphreys a substantial addition to the General A. A.

Humphreys collection, including 249 war maps and 177 letters. Another acquisition is Westcott's *History of Philadelphia,* extra illustrated and enlarged to 32 volumes by Mr. David McN. Stauffer, presented by Mrs. Stauffer. Among the miscellaneous accessions are letters of Lafayette, John Hancock, Henry Clay, Aaron Burr, Sir Colin Campbell, Sir Robert Peel, Chief Justice Marshall, and others.

The *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* prints in the January number the journal of John Watson, assistant surveyor to the commissioners of the Province of Pennsylvania, December 13, 1750, to March 18, 1751, with an introduction by John W. Jordan. To the same number Mr. Louis Richards contributes an article on Jacob Rush of the Pennsylvania judiciary (1747–1820).

The Maryland Historical Society has received typewritten copies of forty letters of Thomas Tudor Tucker, member of the Continental Congress from South Carolina 1787–1788, representative 1789–1793, and treasurer of the United States 1801–1828. The letters are of the period 1791–1808.

The contents of the December number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* include a sketch of Richard Bennet, governor of Virginia, 1651–1655, by Mary N. Browne, some Notes on Maryland Parishes, by Rev. Ethan Allen, continuations of the letters of Rev. Jonathan Boucher and of the vestry proceedings of St. Ann's Parish, and the concluding installment of the French and Indian War Roster.

As a tribute to Professor William A. Dunning on the occasion of his being elected to the presidency of the American Historical Association, a number of his former students have gathered into a volume a group of their essays, to which they have given the collective title *Studies in Southern History and Politics,* and have inscribed the volume to Professor Dunning. The editor of the volume is Professor James W. Garner, whose contribution (the last in the volume) is on Southern Politics since the Civil War. Other contributors are: W. L. Fleming, Deportation and Colonization; U. B. Phillips, Literary Movement for Secession; C. W. Ramsdell, the Frontier and Secession; M. L. Bonham, jr., French Consuls in the Confederate States; S. D. Brummer, the Judicial Interpretation of the Confederate Constitution; J. G. deR. Hamilton, Southern Legislation in respect to Freedmen; C. Mildred Thompson, Carpet-Baggers in the United States Senate; E. C. Woolley, Grant's Southern Policy; W. W. Davis, the Federal Enforcement Acts; W. Roy Smith, Negro Suffrage in the South; W. K. Boyd, Some Phases of Educational History in the South since 1865; Holland Thompson, the New South, Economic and Social; C. E. Merriam, the Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun; and D. Y. Thomas, Southern Political Theories.

The Eleventh Annual Report of the Library Board and Librarian of the Virginia State Library lists as the chief accession of the past year a

body of 117 manuscripts recovered from the heirs of the late Benson J. Lossing. Among them is a valuable series of letters of Lafayette to Governors Jefferson and Nelson, and some Washington and Rochambeau material. The Library has just issued a new volume of the *Journals of the House of Burgesses,* extending from 1656 to 1694; the last volume will contain material of the preceding period.

The January number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* includes among its varied contents the Minutes of the Council and General Court, 1622–1629; some minutes of a committee of trade and plantations and other documents of November and December, 1677; the declaration of war against France and Spain, July 4, 1702, a letter of marque to Capt. Thomas Tudor, August 12, 1702, and other council papers of the period; eight letters of Thomas Adams, 1768–1775, throwing light on Virginia trade just before the Revolution; and some county court proceedings in Virginia in 1734.

Among the contents of the January number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly* the extracts from the diary of Edmund Ruffin, 1861–1864, touching several aspects of the Civil War, are of general interest.

The *Fifth Biennial Report* of the North Carolina Historical Commission (December 1, 1912, to November 30, 1914) has appeared. Notable among the accessions of manuscripts are the papers of Col. W. H. S. Burgwyn, pertaining to the Civil War; the Archibald D. Murphey papers, now published; the papers of Chief Justice Thomas Ruffin; a collection of 73 letters to and from Nathaniel Macon, Weldon N. Edwards, and William Eaton; a collection of colonial papers (207), received from Miss Tillie Bond of Edenton; and a manuscript, "Richard Hugg King and his Times: Reminiscences of Rev. Eli Caruthers", which throws interesting light on social and religious conditions of the early nineteenth century. An important accession of newspapers is a file of bound volumes of the *Fayetteville Observer,* 1825–1864. The commission has in press *Private Schools of North Carolina, 1790–1840: a Documentary History,* edited by Charles L. Coon, and has in preparation the *Papers of Thomas Ruffin,* edited by J. G. deR. Hamilton, and the *Papers of Willie P. Mangum,* edited by Stephen B. Weeks. It will also publish Dr. Weeks's *Bibliography of North Carolina.* The commission now has new and excellent modern quarters in the new state administration building.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has brought out *The Papers of Archibald D. Murphey,* in two volumes, edited by William Henry Hoyt. Murphey's career (*ca.* 1777–1832) is of importance in North Carolina history because of his activities in behalf of internal improvements in the state and of a system of public instruction, and he also planned to write a history of the state. His correspondence and papers accordingly bear largely upon these three topics. Volume I. comprises the correspondence, letters from and to Murphey, arranged in

one chronological order (1801–1832), preceded by W. A. Graham's brief *Memoir,* first published in 1860. The letters are derived from an important body of Murphey papers recently acquired by the editor, from the manuscripts of Chief Justice Thomas Ruffin, owned by the family, from manuscripts in possession of the University of North Carolina, and from scattered sources. Volume II. is made up chiefly of reprints, including Murphey's public papers, such as committee reports in the North Carolina legislature, his historical and literary papers, and even a number of productions by other pens than Murphey's. Among the latter is General Joseph Graham's *Narrative of the Revolutionary War in North Carolina.* The editor has supplied numerous explanatory notes throughout the volumes. One typographical defect in vol. II. must be mentioned. Except where the title-page of a pamphlet is reproduced there is usually no clear typographical indication of the beginnings and endings of the several documents.

The *Historical Papers,* series X., of the Trinity College Historical Society includes an account of Reconstruction in Cleveland County, North Carolina, by J. R. Davis, an investigation of the Quakers and the North Carolina Manumission Society (1776–1834), by P. M. Sherrill, a study of Currency and Banking in North Carolina, 1790–1836, by Professor W. K. Boyd, and part II. (1789–1797) of the Journal and Travel of James Meacham, part I. of which appeared in series IX. of the *Historical Papers.*

Vol. XIII., no. 2, of *The James Sprunt Historical Publications* comprises a group of letters (1780–1843) of the Harrington family of North Carolina. The progenitor of the family was Henry William Harrington, brigadier-general of North Carolina militia, to whom most of the earlier letters are written. A larger part of the collection is of the period of the War of 1812, including numerous letters to and from the general's son, Henry William Harrington, a midshipman in the United States navy.

The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine prints in the October issue a series of letters (1715–1754) of the Broughton family of South Carolina annotated by D. E. Huger Smith. Some of the letters bear upon the Yamassee War and the Spanish invasion of Georgia. Judge Henry A. M. Smith gives an account in this issue of the *Magazine* of Landgrave Ketelby's barony.

The Department of Archives and History of Mississippi has recently acquired the original records and correspondence, 1809–1835, of the Bank of Mississippi.

The third number (December) of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains three valuable studies in widely separated fields: Richard Henderson and the Occupation of Kentucky, by Archibald Henderson, Some Aspects of British Administration in West Florida, by Clarence

E. Carter, and the South and the Right of Secession in the Early Fifties, by Arthur C. Cole. An excellent survey of Historical Activities in the Old Southwest is given by Professor St. George L. Sioussat. In the documents section is "A Journal of Major-General Anthony Wayne's Campaign Against the Shawanee Indians in Ohio in 1794–1795", kept by Lieutenant William Clark, and now edited by R. C. McGrane. The March number contains a general review of Mr. Schouler's *History of the United States,* by Professor Orin G. Libby, and four other articles: on the Methods and Operations of the Scioto Group of Speculators, by Professor Archer B. Hulbert; on Diplomacy concerning the Santa Fé Road, by Professor William R. Manning; on a Neglected Critic of our Civil War (M. Forcade of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*), by Mr. L. M. Sears; and on Methodist Church Influence in Southern Politics, by Professor W. W. Sweet; likewise some important documents on the Fort Dearborn Massacre.

The Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society for January contains an article by A. C. Quisenberry on the Battle of New Orleans, and an account, largely historical, of the Panama Canal, by M. H. Thatcher, late Isthmian Canal commissioner and head of the department of civil administration, Canal Zone.

After a period of quiescence, owing to the illness and death of Col. R. T. Durrett, the Filson Club has renewed its activities and has issued its twenty-seventh publication, entitled *Petitions of the Early Inhabitants of Kentucky to the General Assembly of Virginia, 1769–1792,* edited by Dr. James R. Robertson.

A *History of De Kalb County, Tennessee* (to 1865), by W. T. Hale, the author of a number of monographs in Tennessee history, has been brought out in Nashville by P. Hunter.

A monograph entitled "History of the Democratic Party Organization in the Northwest, 1824–1840", by Dr. Homer J. Webster, of the department of history in the University of Pittsburgh, forms the entire contents (pp. 120) of the January number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly.* The material, drawn almost entirely from newspapers of the period, has been treated with thoroughness and to good purpose.

Not long ago Miami University became the custodian of the library of Ohio Valley material collected by the late Samuel Fulton Covington of Madisonville, Ohio. By the terms of the transfer the collection is to be kept intact, and several important additions have already been made to it. A catalogue of the collection as it now exists has been issued as a university *Bulletin* (October, 1914), *The Samuel F. Covington Library of Ohio Valley History, with a Sketch of Samuel Fulton Covington* (pp. 75). The sketch is by J. E. Bradford, the catalogue by S. J. Brandenburg.

The General Assembly of Indiana in its late session provided for the appointment of a Historical Commission to collect and publish documentary and other material relating to the history of the state.

The three principal papers in the December number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* deal respectively with the educational and religious history, and the economic development of the state. These articles are: the Academies of Indiana, a tentative investigation of the subject, by J. H. Thomas; Early Methodist Circuits in Indiana, by W. W. Sweet; and Indiana's Growth, 1812–1820, by W. F. Mitchell. The March number includes, besides a continuation of Mr. Thomas's paper, the Flow of Colonists to and from Indiana before the Civil War, by W. O. Lynch, and French Settlements in Floyd County, by Alice L. Green.

The principal paper in the April (1914) issue of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* is a study of the Know-Nothing Movement in Illinois, 1854–1856, by John P. Senning. Some of the briefer articles are: a diary of Anna R. Morrison, November, 1840, to March, 1841, chiefly of journeyings in Illinois; an account, by W. W. Sweet, of Bishop Matthew Simpson's oration at the funeral of Abraham Lincoln; some Reminiscences of General U. S. Grant, by General Frederick D. Grant; and a sketch, by Dr. Daniel Berry, of John M. Robinson, United States senator from Illinois, 1832–1843.

The Chicago Historical Society's *Annual Report* for 1914, besides recording with the usual fullness the society's activities during the year, contains a descriptive catalogue of the accessions to the society's library, notable among them being Chicago imprints and Lincolniana. There were also numerous accessions of minor manuscripts. Sketches of deceased members occupy 26 pages of the report.

The *Report* of the trustees of the Newberry Library for the year 1914 records some accessions of interest. Among the manuscripts acquired are a collection by and relating to Eleazar Williams, letters of Cadwallader Colden, James Logan, James Madison, and Henry R. Schoolcraft, and a large body of transcripts from the archives of the Indies at Seville. Many of these relate to the early exploration, conquest, and settlement of New Mexico, including an apparently unknown chronicle, 436 pages in extent, by Baltasar Obregon, entitled "Crónica, Comentarios ó Relaciones de los Descubrimientos Antiguos y Modernos de Nueva España y del Nuevo México" (1584). There are also about 1000 pages of transcripts descriptive of encroachments from the colony of Georgia upon Florida territory, 1733–1738.

The Michigan Historical Commission has issued its *Second Annual Report*, which explains succinctly the several tasks which the commission is performing in behalf of Michigan historical interests. Among these tasks are: a Michigan bibliography, including a list of Michigan maps, a volume of Michigan biography, a list of existing files of Michi-

gan newspapers, and a list of memorials and commemorations. All of these are in course of preparation. In addition the commission is co-operating with the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society and the University of Michigan in the publication of original documents and historical studies, and with other organizations in procurng transcripts from European archives.

The Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society held its midwinter meeting at Muskegon February 17 and 18. The varied programme of its sessions included the following addresses: the Significance of Michigan in the History of the Northwest, by William L. Jenks; Holland Emigration to Michigan: its Causes and Results, by Gerrit J. Diekema; Personal Recollections of Carl Schurz as Editor of the Detroit *Post*, by Edward G. Holden; the Story of Grosse Isle, or the Early Days of Trenton, by Rev. J. R. Command; Materials for the Study of Michigan History, by S. H. Ranck; and the Contents of the Burton Library, by Clarence M. Burton.

The Minnesota Historical Society will shortly inaugurate the publication of a quarterly *Bulletin*, in which will be published the papers read at the meetings of the society and similar material, while the *Collections* will be reserved for documentary material, bibliographies, and other comprehensive works. Volume XV. of the society's *Collections*, made up principally of papers read at meetings of the society and of its executive council since 1908, will be issued soon. The address of Professor Clarence W. Alvord on the Relation of the State to Historical Work, read at the January meeting, will be published as the first number of the new *Bulletin*. A comprehensive *History of Minnesota*, in three volumes, prepared for the society by Professor W. W. Folwell, is nearly ready for the press. Considerable progress has been made in the preparation of an inventory of the archives of Minnesota, which the society, through Mr. Herbert A. Kellar, has undertaken in co-operation with the public archives commission of the American Historical Association.

The January number of the *Annals of Iowa* includes a history of the great seals of Iowa, by C. C. Stiles, brief accounts of the Lutherans in Iowa, by several hands, and a continuation of the bibliography of Iowa authors, by Alice Marple.

In the January number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* is an extended article on the Early History of Lead Mining in the Iowa Country, by Jacob Van der Zee.

The Missouri Historical Society Collections, vol. IV., no. 3, includes the Removal of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Missouri in 1865, by Thomas K. Skinker; Founding and Location of William Jewell College, by Dr. L. M. Lawson; History of the "Chanson de l'Année du Coup", by Wilson Primm, edited by W. C. Breckenridge; Instructions of Jacques Toutant Beauregard to his Son concerning a Voyage to the Illinois,

1779, translated by Nettie H. Beauregard; part VIII. of Charles A. Krone's Recollections of an Old Actor, etc.

The January number of the *Missouri Historical Review* contains a sketch, by D. K. Greger, of Garland Carr Broadhead, railroad engineer and naturalist, and a bibliography of his numerous writings, which include a number of papers in Missouri history. To the same number Mr. Joseph A. Mudd of Hyattsville, Maryland, contributes a paper on the Cabell Descendants in Missouri, which has biographical as well as genealogical interest.

Missouri the Center State, 1821–1915, in two volumes, by W. B. Stevens, is from the press of S. J. Clarke.

The January number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains the concluding part of R. G. Cleland's study, Early Sentiment for the Annexation of California; the second of Mrs. Adele B. Looscan's papers concerning Harris County, Texas; the second installment of W. Y. Allen's Reminiscences of Texas, the reprint of which, edited by W. S. Red, was begun in the number for January, 1914; and a continuation of British Correspondence concerning Texas, edited by Professor E. D. Adams.

The *Second Biennial Report* of the Texas Library and Historical Commission contains a calendar of the papers of M. B. Lamar, president of the Republic of Texas, prepared by Miss Elizabeth H. West, archivist of the state library.

Vol. IV. of the *Collections* of the State Historical Society of North Dakota will shortly come from the press. It is understood that the volume contains, in addition to an unusual number of sketches designed to illustrate early territorial history, an historical survey of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Red River trade, together with reprints of numerous documents pertaining to the subject.

"The Nebraska Aborigines as they appeared in the Eighteenth Century", by Father Michael A. Shine, forms the principal contents of vol. IX., no. 1, of the Nebraska Academy of Science *Publications*.

Bank Deposit Guaranty in Nebraska, by Z. Clark Dickinson, forms *Bulletin* no. 6 of the *Nebraska History and Political Science* series.

In the January number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* Mr. T. C. Elliott gives some account of the Fur Trade in the Columbia River Basin prior to 1811, that is, prior to the founding of Astoria. The Journal of John Work, with introduction and notes by the same writer, is continued (July 5 to September 15, 1826). The "New Vancouver Journal", edited by Professor Edmond S. Meany, is concluded in this number.

The June number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* contains the memorial address, delivered by Charles B. Moores at Cham-

poeg, May 2, 1914, commemorating the life, character, and services of Francis Xavier Matthieu, whose vote in the historic meeting of May 2, 1843, is said to have decided the destiny of Oregon. The same number contains a paper, "First Things pertaining to Presbyterianism on the Pacific Coast", by Robert H. Blossom, and the second part of the Journal of David Thompson, edited by T. C. Elliott. The most important item in the September number is the diary of Samuel Royal Thurston, first delegate to Congress from Oregon Territory. Thurston's term of service was from December 3, 1849, to March 4, 1851, and the diary covers a little more than nine months of this period, beginning November 21, 1849, and closing August 29, 1850. The entries are principally records of his activities in behalf of Oregon interests, but shed many side-lights on proceedings in Congress and on the politics of the time. This number of the *Quarterly* contains also an investigation, by Professor Clark E. Persinger of the University of Nebraska, of the "Bargain of 1844" as the Origin of the Wilmot Proviso, and a letter of Quincy Adams Brooks, November 7, 1851, describing his journey across the plains.

The Diary of Nelson Kingsley: a California Argonaut of 1849, edited by Frederick J. Teggart, has been published by the University of California.

A Decade of American Government in the Philippines (pp. xiv, 66), by David P. Barrows, was prepared by the author as an additional chapter to the third edition (1914) of his *History of the Philippines,* first published in 1903. Its separate publication is to meet the desire for a brief historical review of the events of the last ten years. The author not only summarizes the political and administrative history of the period, but points out the principal economic and educational results of the American occupation.

A number of notable volumes in Canadian history have recently appeared. *Recollections of Sixty Years in Canada,* by Sir Charles Tupper, announced some months ago, have been published in Toronto (Cassell), and the *Political Reminiscences of Sir Charles Tupper* have been brought out in London (Constable). Another important work is the *Life and Times of Sir George Etienne Cartier,* by John Boyd, which comes from the press of Macmillan (Toronto). Besides the *Life and Times of Lord Strathcona,* by W. T. R. Preston, quite recently from the press (London, Nash), and the life by Dr. John Macnaughton, announced by Morang and Company of Toronto, it is now understood that Cassell and Company will publish an authorized biography.

The *Annual Report* of the Ontario Historical Society for 1914 includes a record of the society's meeting, June 2–4, 1914, at Ottawa, and the reports of the numerous affiliated societies. The address of the retiring president, Mr. John Dearness, on the Sphere of the Historical

Societies, is given in full. One of the affiliated societies, the Brant Historical Society, of Brantford, it may be noted, will publish in four numbers the *Life of Brant and the History of the Six Nation Indians.*

Scribner's South American series now includes *Mexico: its Ancient and Modern Civilization, History, and Political Conditions, Topography and Natural Resources,* by C. Reginald Enoch, with an introduction by Martin Hume.

In the November issue of the *Boletín de Ingenieros* (Mexico) Professor Enrique E. Schultz continues his study "Los Origines del Régimen Constitucional en Hispano-América y los Albores de la Patria Mexicana".

Carranza and Mexico, by Carlo de Fornaro, with chapters by Col. I. C. Enriquez, Charles Ferguson, and M. C. Rolland, just issued by Kennerley, is understood to be written from the standpoint of the revolution.

The Spanish Dependencies in South America: an Introduction to the History of their Civilization, in two volumes, by Professor Bernard Moses, published in London by Smith, Elder, and Company, is brought out in this country by Harper and Brothers.

Simón Bolívar, Libertador de la América del Sur: por los más grandes Escritores Americanos (Madrid and Buenos Aires, Renacimiento, 1914, pp. xvi, 543) is a collection of studies of Bolívar's character and career, with some briefer appreciations, emanating from every American country. The contributions to the volume are from Juan Montalvo (Ecuador), F. García Calderón (Peru), P. M. Arcaya and R. Blanco-Fombona (Venezuela), L. Duarte Level (Mexico), A. Galindo, Francisco José Urrutia, Cornelio Hispano and Jorge Ricardo Vejarano (Colombia), Ernesto de la Cruz and B. Vicuña Mackenna (Chile), J. B. Alberdi (Argentina), José Martí (Cuba), J. E. Rodó (Uruguay), José Veríssimo (Brazil), and F. Loraine Petre. The last-named writer was presumed to represent the United States, and a chapter from his work, *Simón Bolívar: el Libertador,* translated by R. Blanco-Fombona, with critical notes, was inserted. Afterwards he was discovered to be an Englishman.

The sixteenth volume of the *Obras Completas* of Diego Barros Arana contains the *Historia de la Guerra del Pacífico, 1879–1881* (Santiago de Chile, 1914, pp. 535).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. L. Paxson, *The New American History* (Quarterly Review, January); R. W. Neeser, *The British Naval Operations in the West Indies, 1650–1700: a Study in Naval Administration* (U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, November–December); A. J. Morrison, *Lord Granville's Line* [in N. C.] (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); C. H. McCarthy, *Washington, his Allies, and his Friends* (Catholic University Bulletin, December); H. B. Learned, *Relations of the Legislature and the Executive* (Nation, February 11);

F. H. Hodder, *"Dough Faces": the Occasion upon which John Randolph coined this Phrase and a Discussion of its Source and Meaning* (*ibid.*, March 4); A. R. H. Ransom, *Reminiscences of the Civil War,* VI. (Sewanee Review, February); P. A. Bruce, *Plantation Memories of the Civil War* (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); W. Hasbach, *Die Neuere Verfassungsentwicklung in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Zeitschrift für Politik, VII. 1); Admiral von Diederichs, *A Statement of Events in Manila, May–October, 1898,* translation (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, November); Emlin McClain, *Decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on Constitutional Questions, 1911–1914* (American Political Science Review, February); G. W. Goethals, *The Building of the Panama Canal,* I. (Scribner's Magazine, March); É. Chartier, *Avant l'Insurrection de 1837–38: Lettres de C.-O. Perrault* (Revue Canadienne, January); H. von Ihering, *Das Alter des Menschen in Südamerika* (Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, XLVI. 2).

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

To the list of doctoral dissertations in progress, printed in our January number, the following might now be added (and see also p. 689, above, *ad med*).

J. R. Knipfing, A.B. Cornell 1910. (Change of subject): the Roman State and Christianity, 138–337. *Columbia.*

Raymond Moley, Ph.B. Baldwin 1906; A.M. Oberlin 1913. The Presidential Campaign of 1896. *Columbia.*

R. W. Sockman, A.B. Ohio Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Columbia 1913. The Revival of Monasticism in England in the Nineteenth Century. *Columbia.*

By error, on page 502 in our last number, the title of Mr. Eric McCoy North's privately printed dissertation was wrongly stated; it is *Early Methodist Philanthropy.*

Volume XX] *July, 1915* [*Number 4*

The

American Historical Review

THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF THE DECLINE OF ANCIENT CULTURE

NO one will question the fact that there was, at the end of the period of ancient history, an immense decrease in the quantity and quality of the production of those human goods whose sum represents that all-inclusive thing which we call civilization. We are all agreed as to the area of the world's surface included in the sphere of ancient culture, namely, the ancient Mediterranean world. There is some divergence of opinion, however, in regard to the time at which the rapid decline in intellectual interest and vigor occurred. Far greater is the diversity of opinion as to the reasons which underlie this, the most tragic act in the drama of human development. The causes usually advanced in histories written in English may be summarized as follows: (1) the ancient system of slavery; (2) the decrease in population; (3) the ancient system of taxation; (4) the constant drain of precious metals to the East; (5) Christianity; (6) the infiltration of barbarians into the empire. There are a number of lesser causes which are cited here and there. These six, however, are the ones commonly presented as most important.[1] Fortunately the old view of the moral degeneration of ancient society as a primal cause for the decline seems to have been pretty generally abandoned.[2] I am, therefore, relieved of the necessity of refuting it.

[1] They are chiefly based on the following authorities: an article by Thomas Hodgkin in the *Contemporary Review*, LXXIII. 51–70 (1898), entitled "The Fall of the Roman Empire and its Lessons for us"; Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire Générale du IV^e Siècle à nos Jours* (Paris, 1893), I. 28–31; John G. Sheppard, *The Fall of Rome and the Rise of the New Nationalities* (London, 1861); Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders* (Oxford, 1892), II. 532 and 533.

[2] It will still be found, but used with great caution, in George Burton Adams, *Civilization during the Middle Ages* (1904), p. 79. It should be definitely set aside, both because the fact is incapable of proof and because the effects of sexual immorality of individuals upon society at large have not, so far as my knowledge goes, been scientifically determined.

An essential weakness of the old discussions of the causes of the decline lies in the fact that they did not sharply define the character of the catastrophe and the relative time at which it occurred. It is a matter of internal decay, a desiccation of intellectual vigor in no way induced by external circumstances and accidents. Its manifestations appear markedly after the principate of Trajan when the martial vigor of the Roman Empire still seemed unabated and its powers of expansion unimpaired. The intellectual bankruptcy of the ancient world is declared in the period stretching from about 150 A.D. to 300 A.D. From the time of Constantine forward we are in another intellectual world.[3] It goes without saying that the process of decay, despite its sudden manifestation, was a gradual one. Posidonius of Rhodes stands out as the last great scientific mind which the Greek world produced.[4] Isolated figures appear after his day, like that of Galen, court physician to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, whose works echo reminiscently the tones of the great days and the ideas of the master minds. But the great days were past and the masters were dust.

In what ways can we specifically prove so illusive a thing as a decline in human intellectual vigor? Eduard Meyer has enumerated a number of evidences of the decline in his *Wirtschaftliche Entwickelung*.[5] In addition to and in confirmation of the list which he gives there is much evidence that might be cited. The art of the age of Constantine is so vitally different from that of the period of the Antonines that the brilliant Polish archaeologist, Josef Strzygowski, was constrained to explain it as a recrudescence of the artistic canons and forms of the old Oriental art of Pharaonic Egypt.[6] His explanation has not been widely accepted. But the fact of the tremendous loss in artistic conception and technique is apparent.[7] It is best explained, since it occurs throughout the empire, as due to the depraving of Graeco-Roman artistic standards and output, a retrogression to primitive forms and viewpoint.[8] The conventional

[3] Eduard Meyer, *Die Wirtschaftliche Entwickelung des Altertums* (Jena, 1895); revised and reprinted in *Kleine Schriften* (Halle, 1910). This article must certainly be used as the foundation of any new treatment of the economic causes of the decline of ancient culture.

[4] Von Wilamowitz, *Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen und Römer*, p. 184.

[5] See *Kleine Schriften*, p. 146, note 1.

[6] Josef Strzygowski, *Orient oder Rom: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Spät-Antiken und Früh-Christlichen Kunst* (Leipzig, 1901).

[7] See the porphyry groups from Saint Mark's at Venice which Strzygowski has discussed in *Klio*, II. 105 ff.

[8] So Furtwängler explains it in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* (1903), p. 947.

types of the coins of the third century strikingly illustrate the decadence of art and the debasement of social life.[9]

The falling off in the spirit of commercial enterprise is evidenced by the history of the trade of the empire with India. As proved by the finds of Roman coins in India the eastern trade flourished from the time of Augustus to that of the Antonines.[10] It reached its greatest height about the last of the first century.[11] Evidences of continued trade exist until the middle of the third century, followed by a lull which lasted until a revival occurred at the close of the fourth century. Another drastic proof of decline, which is often advanced as a cause, is to be found in the wrecking of the imperial administration in the third century which resulted in the rebellion and independence of exposed territorial units of the empire. By the weakness of the central authority these districts were forced to undertake their own measures of defense and administration.[12]

The correct placing of the bankruptcy of ancient civilization is sufficient to eliminate two of the causes advanced to explain the intellectual poverty and degradation of vitality which succeeded upon the wealth of culture and splendid vigor of the great period of Greek and Roman life. The first of these is the barbarian peril, commonly formulated as the "incursion", "infiltration", or "invasions" of the barbarians. Before the time of Marcus Aurelius there had been no vital harm done by the barbarian invasions, such as had occurred in the third, second, and first centuries B.C. The Greek and Roman world had suffered "infiltration" from early times and had, as it always would have done under healthful conditions, absorbed these elements without pathological results. It was when internal disorders had lowered the resistance of imperial society, from 200 A.D. onward, that the barbarian invasions accelerated the process of decline and powerfully accentuated the hardness and crudity of life which other causes had long since prepared and produced.

The second force which may be eliminated as a destructive factor by the sharper definition of the primary period of decadence is Christianity. It is an impossibility to obtain any satisfactory statistics upon which to base an estimate of the relative proportion of the Christian to the pagan population of the empire even in the third

[9] E. Babelon, *Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines* (Paris, 1906), I. 62.

[10] G. F. Hill, "Roman Aurei from Pudukota, South India", in *Numismatic Chronicle*, third series, XVIII. 304 ff. (1898).

[11] Speck, *Handelsgeschichte des Altertums* (Leipzig, 1900), I. 197.

[12] See Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 146, note 1.

century. Adolf Harnack's careful study of the evidence obtainable leads him to conclude that in 300 A.D. the percentage of Christians in the eastern portions of the empire fell far below one-half of the total population. In the West the proportion must be greatly reduced below that in the East.[13] About 250 A.D. the Christian community in Rome, the oldest and strongest of the churches of the West, may well have formed between three and five per cent. of the total population of the city.[14] The first traces of Christianity which the Greek papyri have brought us from Egypt are a few certificates made out to people who had officially proved that they were not Christians.[15] These are of the year 250 A.D., in the time of the persecution under Decius. A business letter from a Christian in Rome to a brother Christian in the Fayum which mentions the Alexandrian Bishop Maximus falls within the years 264–282 A.D.[16] This is all that we have upon the Christians of Egypt in the several thousand extant papyri preceding the persecutions under Diocletian. Until further papyri may have changed the impression left by this lack of Christian documents from Egypt before 300 A.D. we are not justified in postulating a large Christian population in that country. It is therefore impossible to assign to Christianity any marked influence upon the empire, either economically or socially, before 300 A.D.[17]

The old belief that the growth of the ascetic ideal and monasticism affected the empire by withdrawing vigorous elements from participation in active life has, I judge, been entirely abandoned. This development, which is to be assigned to the fourth century,[18] came much too late to be considered seriously as a cause of decline, even if the numbers of those affected ever justified such an assumption.

The theory of the drainage of gold to India in coin and bullion is based upon two statements in Pliny's *Natural History* and upon the fact that a number of finds of Roman imperial coins have been made in India during the past century. Pliny says (*Natural History*, VI. 101): "This subject [the route from Egypt to India] is worthy of attention since India in no year drains less than 50,000,000 sesterces [550,000,000 according to the corrupt text of Pliny], of

13 Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, II. 277.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 211, note 4.

15 Ulrich Wilcken, *Papyruskunde, Grundzüge*, p. 130, and *Chrestomathie*, nos. 124 and 125 (Leipzig, 1912). Several other similar certificates, which are in the city library of Hamburg, have not yet been published.

16 Wilcken, *Papyruskunde, Chrestomathie*, no. 126.

17 See Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, II. 287.

18 Harnack, *Das Mönchthum* (fifth ed., Giessen, 1901), p. 8.

our empire, remitting in goods which are sold among us at a hundred fold gain." Again he says (*Natural History,* XII. 84): "India and Seres and that Peninsula [Arabia] take away from our empire annually, at the lowest computation, 100,000,000 sesterces. So much do our luxuries and our women cost us." This has been generally accepted as meaning that these sums—$2,500,000 for India alone, $5,000,000 for Arabia, India, and Seres—went out of the empire in coinage or in bar,[19] although there is nothing in either passage, which, in my judgment, necessitates this interpretation. On the contrary, in the first passage Pliny mentions the importance of the route from Egypt to India because of the trade which plied between them. Certainly the ships from Egypt went to India laden with goods, not money alone. If we accept Pliny's statement at its face value and reckon the complete sum for the period from Augustus to Antoninus Pius, we come to the conclusion that the drainage of Roman imperial coins to India was $750,000,000 during the period of the height of the Indian-Roman trade. The sum seems quite out of proportion to the possible gold and silver supply of the ancient world. I cannot accept the passages of Pliny, in themselves of questionable interpretation, as sufficient proof of the drainage of imperial coins to India. There are no other authorities, so far as my knowledge goes, upon which such a claim may be based.

Even in the pages of Pliny assurance may be had that the trade with India was one of exchange of the products of the empire for many forms of eastern goods necessary to the high standard of living maintained within the empire. He states, for example, that India had neither copper nor lead, and exchanged her gems and pearls for these.[20] He indicates in two places that the gain to the Roman merchants engaged in the Indian trade was large.[21] A report has come down to us of the exports and imports of northern India as they passed into and out of Barygaza (Broach on the Gulf of Cambay).[22] The exports were onyx, myrrh, Indian muslins, mallows, a great deal of coarse linens, nard, costus (a pepper-

[19] E. Speck, *Handelsgechichte des Altertums,* I. 201. The two quotations from Pliny are usually supported by the vague statement in a letter of Tiberius to the senate (Tacitus, *Annals,* III. 53), in which Tiberius is made to say that the money of the empire was sent to foreign or hostile races to buy precious stones for the Roman women. The letter of Tiberius was "edited" by Tacitus, not given verbatim. Furthermore we know nothing as to the truth or falsity of Tiberius's statement. It is meagre proof of the drain of money to India.

[20] Pliny, *Naturalis Historia,* XXXIV. 163.

[21] *Ibid.,* VI. 101, and XIV. 52.

[22] *Anonymi Periplus Maris Erythraei* in Carolus Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores,* vol. I.

like spice), and leeches. It is distinctly stated that these were goods destined for the empire trade.[23] An additional list of exports includes ivory, lycium (a medicinal plant), silks, yarn, and long peppers. The imports passing into India *via* Barygaza were: wines, chiefly Italian, Laodicean, and Arabian; copper and tin; coral and chrysolith; cheap garments of every sort; highly embroidered girdles; styrax (a gum for incense); honey clover; gold and silver coins, which were exchanged with some profit for the local coinage.[24] The imports destined for the Indian king of that reign were regal—heavy silver plate, musical instruments, shapely maidens, wine of superior quality, costly garments, and a fine quality of myrrh. The indications are that the export of luxuries westward into the empire was met by a fairly equal amount of luxuries carried eastward from the empire. Furthermore, the annual balance of credit, as indicated by Pliny's statement of the great profit in the Indian trade, seems to have been favorable to the empire's merchants.

In addition to the proofs given that there is no responsible authority behind the theory of a great export of money to India from the empire, a number of other considerations help to make the idea untenable. I have been able to trace but five important finds of Roman coins in India, four of which are mentioned by Mommsen.[25] The fifth is a hoard discovered early in the year 1898 in the territory of the Rajah of Pudukota.[26] Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain a copy of the *Coin Catalogue of the Madras Government Museum* in which the finds of Roman coins in India are gathered together by Mr. Edgar Thurston. The catalogue of coins of the Indian Museum at Calcutta shows but nine Roman coins of undoubted genuineness, as against 118 Graeco-Bactrian, 10 Seleucid, 15 Greek, and 42 Parthian coins.[27] The catalogue of the Panjab Museum at Lahore shows no Roman coins.[28] It is surprising, not that Roman coins have been found in India at all, but that so few finds have been recorded. India at the present time absorbs large quantities of silver from Europe and America, probably a

[23] *καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἐμποριαν τὴν ἡμετέραν, l. c.*

[24] Mommsen's suggestion regarding the use of an inferior plated coin in the Indian trade of the empire (in Mommsen-Blacas, *Histoire de la Monnaie Romaine,* III. 337, note 1, and p. 338) as a sort of "trade dollar", is based upon this passage, and the fact that denarii of Augustus have been found in considerable numbers in India, which are of base metal plated with silver.

[25] Mommsen-Blacas, III. 337, note 2.

[26] G. F. Hill in the *Numismatic Chronicle,* third series, XVIII. 304 ff.

[27] Charles J. Rodgers, *Catalogue of Coins, Indian Museum at Calcutta* (Calcutta, 1893).

[28] R. B. Whitehead, *Catalogue of Coins in the Panjab Museum, Lahore* (Oxford, 1914).

larger quantity in relation to its exports than from the Roman Empire in ancient times. This silver does not return, because of the immemorial practice of hoarding still prevalent in India.[29] Yet we do not apply to England and America of to-day Mun's mercantile theory, that the economic well-being of a country is measured by the surplus in money derived from its favorable balance of trade with another country. No more should it be applied to the Roman Empire in its trade relations with India.[30]

The disappearance of commodity money from circulation in the Roman world was due to hoarding within the empire. This is sufficiently attested by the hundreds of finds of coins in all parts of the empire.[31] Hoarding was due, primarily, to the lack of deposit banks[32] and was greatly increased when economic disorders began to appear in the second century and reached their climax in the third century after Christ.

It is quite impossible to regard the depopulation of the empire as a cause of decline in its culture. The reasons for this statement may be briefly given. 1. Our sources of information upon the population of the ancient world are exceedingly meagre. Of the general census returns from the various parts of the Roman Empire we have only a few notices and their accuracy is very problematic. In other words we have no reliable statistics. We must be chary of making general deductions on the basis of statements of even the best ancient historians, such as Polybius. This attitude of scepticism is, of course, all the more essential when we deal with the historians who rank as secondary and tertiary sources of information.[33] 2. Upon general considerations of the movements of population there is reason to believe that the total population of the empire in-

[29] Ad. Soetbeer, "Die Werthrelationen der Edelmetalle", in Hirth's *Annalen des Deutschen Reiches* (1875), pp. 317–318.

[30] My colleague, Professor C. A. Smith, has suggested that the idea of the drainage of gold and silver to India and its disastrous effects upon the ancient Roman economic order probably arose from the application of Mun's mercantile theory, in the seventeenth or eighteenth century, to the statements quoted above from Pliny's *Natural History*. See Thomas Mun, *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade* (reprinted by Macmillan, New York, 1895), pp. 29–30.

[31] See the list of 871 finds of coins in France, Belgium, Luxemburg, and the Rhenish provinces of Germany, recorded by Adrian Blanchet in *Les Trésors de Monnaies Romaines et les Invasions Germaniques en Gaule* (Paris, 1900), pp. 31–53. The great majority of these fall within the period from the accession of Augustus to the death of Constantine the Great.

[32] T. Louis Comparette, *Debasement of the Silver Coinage under the Emperor Nero* (New York, 1914), pp. 6–7.

[33] See Eduard Meyer's article upon the population of the ancient world in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, II. 900. Meyer's article is the basis of my attitude upon this question.

creased steadily during the first century and a half after Christ. For the cities this is made probable by their areas, as shown by excavations upon ancient sites. For the agricultural districts during the same period, the time of the growth of the colonate, an increase, rather than a decrease, would better accord with the general theory of population and poverty.[34] Statistics are, of course, absolutely lacking. 3. The depopulation of the third and succeeding centuries is primarily a result of decline and only secondarily and in the culmination of disasters a cause.[35]

For our knowledge of the numbers of the slave population of antiquity and the ratio of slave to free labor the same baffling situation exists as for the question of population. We have no statistics which may be trusted to give us an accurate picture. Consequently the field has been left open to speculation and to general impressions based upon the statements of the literary sources, which should be applied only to specific districts. Again it is Eduard Meyer who has given us a new point of view in his *Sklaverei im Altertum*,[36] correcting the exaggerated and distorted picture presented during the world-wide anti-slavery movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the economic life of the great Oriental section of the Roman Empire, including Egypt,[37] slavery never played an important rôle in agricultural life. In industry and trade slaves were found in the large manufacturing centres, but in limited numbers. Household slaves were a luxury of the rich.[38]

In the Greek communities the rise of slave labor was a feature and a part of the development of "manufactory" industry. From the early part of the sixth century onward the numbers of the slave artisans increased in the cities like Corinth, Aegina, Athens, and Syracuse, which were the centres of industrial life.[39] From the industrial centres the use of slaves spread into agricultural life, but it never became in Greece the dominant form of farm labor, as it later did in Italy and Sicily. In certain portions of Greece, as in the central part of the Peloponnesus and in the middle-western sec-

[34] Francesco S. Nitti, *Population and the Social System* (London, 1894), pp. 146, 148, 149, 162.

[35] For Eduard Meyer's summary of the movements of population in the empire see *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, II. 911–912.

[36] Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, p. 169 ff. The advance made by Eduard Meyer lies in his clear grasp of slavery as an institution which has existed throughout the course of civilization. Economically it is merely one form of the labor supply competing with the supply of free laborers in the labor market.

[37] On the subject of slavery in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt see Ulrich Wilcken, *Papyruskunde, Grundzüge*, pp. 27, 260.

[38] Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 189–192.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

tions of Greece, slavery did not at any time gain a firm foothold. Even in the industrial centres we must not lose sight of the continued existence of free artisan labor, working as units in the hard competition with the capitalistic manufactories, which naturally preferred to use unfree artisans because of the lower production cost. There was no organization of labor for its economic defense. Consequently the picture is that of capital using that form of labor which it could obtain most cheaply and exploit most advantageously. It was the unskilled free labor, naturally, which suffered most in this competition of free workmen against slave workmen. The building inscriptions at Athens show that few slaves were employed in the building trades and that these worked as assistants to the free artisans.

In Italy and Sicily in the last two centuries of the Roman Republic the free peasant undeniably went to the wall in the competition with cheap slave labor employed by the landed proprietors. Special conditions peculiar to the Italian state under Rome's hegemony brought about this result. The conditions existing in these two portions of the empire have given rise to the popular exaggeration of the extent of slavery and the notion of its decisive results upon the ancient economic and social order. After the victory of Octavianus at Actium in 31 B.C. and the establishment of the *pax Romana,* the slave supply, which was largely that of wars of the Roman imperialistic period, diminished greatly. At the same time there was no change in the willingness to emancipate slaves, as evidenced by the emancipation inscriptions. For two centuries, therefore, before the great break manifested itself, slavery had been rapidly decreasing and a new type of labor, neither free nor slave, had been taking its place. The height of the slave system in antiquity was synchronous with the highest development of ancient civilization. The economic background for the decline of ancient culture was not slavery, but the Roman colonate.

It is certain that the breaking of the ancient economic and intellectual order of society was due primarily to causes within the Roman Empire. External relations had little appreciable bearing upon the great change. The faults to be found in the current ideas upon the subject are two in number: (1) the habit of viewing separately certain economic phases of ancient society which were inextricably interwoven and inseparable; (2) an insufficient knowledge of the greatest of the difficulties which faced the Roman Empire—the agrarian problem. Combining the information obtained from comparatively recent finds of papyri and inscriptions with the two important sources previously extant, the literary

sources (including the Latin agrarian writers) and the Theodosian and Justinian codes, the course of the agrarian development becomes fairly clear in its general outlines. Many details must yet be subjected to intensive investigation and reconstruction. Of the extensive literature which has sprung up in the past twenty-five years upon this field of work two studies stand out prominently as fundamental, Rostowzew's book upon the Roman colonate[40] and Weber's investigation of Roman agrarian history.[41]

The statement that the Roman system of taxation was the cause of the shattering of ancient civilization is an obvious half-truth. It merely begs the question. Why did taxation, which is a necessary evil, cause the collapse? Upon whom did the burden of taxation fall? Why could not the burden-bearers endure the weight of their taxes? In like manner it has always seemed to me to be entirely futile to say that ancient civilization finally collapsed because the Greeks and Romans put money into beautiful municipal buildings and sunk their wealth in unproductive public works. The ancients, as well as we, had the right "to furnish to the spirit manifold relaxations from labors, taking heed of public games and festivals in their season, and of an attractive setting for our private lives. For the delight of these things day by day drives away wretchedness."[42] The entire question of taxation, with the inquiry into the legitimate or illegitimate expenditure for public recreation, can only be dealt with in connection with the large problems of production. For the Roman Empire the question of taxation is largely a phase of the wide-spread problem of the organization and administration of the state domains.

The difficulties which invested this side of Roman administrative policy were, for the peninsula of Italy, the results of the early development of Rome herself. But in the provinces they were an evil inheritance of her conquests. There the roots of the difficulty were deeply embedded in the past development of the Greek states, of the Persian Empire, and the empire of the Pharaohs. When Rome absorbed Carthage, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt she brought under her domain, accepted, and spread an economic order that was rapidly developing the seeds of its own doom.

When Alexander the Great conquered the Persian Empire he found that the land of Asia Minor outside of the cities was held

[40] M. Rostowzew, *Studien zur Geschichte des Römischen Kolonats*, I. Beiheft of the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* (Leipzig, 1910).

[41] Max Weber, *Die Römische Agrargeschichte in ihrer Bedeutung für das Staats- und Privatrecht* (Stuttgart, 1891).

[42] Pericles in Thucydides, II. 38.

either as domain land of the Great King or as great proprietary estates.[43] Almost all of the land was apparently given over to nobles and priests, who had emigrated from Iran. Castles arose throughout the country which served as strongholds and as the residences of the foreign land-holding nobility. A free native peasantry was transmuted into a serf population, bound to the soil. In general it is fairly safe to say that the midland of the Persian Empire was characterized by large landed estates held in fee from the Great King. This system probably had attained its characteristic features under the Assyrian Empire.[44] Its origins may be traced deeply into the Babylonian period.

Especially in the Nile valley Alexander assumed control of an agricultural state in which the land had for ages been the farm of the Pharaoh and the laborers his peasants, each enrolled at the definite place where he was called upon for his villein service.[45] In trade and industry, as well as in agrarian production, the Pharaoh had been the one great capitalist capable of far-reaching enterprises. It is probable that the weaving and export of linen had at times been a monopoly of the Egyptian kings.[46] The great mercantile expeditions into Yam (central Africa) under the Old Kingdom and those of Queen Hatshepsut into Punt were entirely royal enterprises. In Babylonia and Assyria, too, the influence of the royal storehouses upon industry and trade must have been overpowering.[47]

Upon this form of land tenure and industrial production the ancient Oriental monarchies had reached a status of relative social equilibrium and stability during the last centuries of the second millennium and the first half of the first millennium B.C. The Persian rule of the empire of western Asia seems to have brought with it economic stagnation. The irrigation system in the Tigris-Euphrates basin declined, and the entire economic vitality seems to have been sapped, along with other causes, by the excessive de-

[43] See Rostowzew, *Geschichte des Röm. Kolonats,* pp. 240–243. For the manorial estates in Lydia and Maeonia see Georges Radet, *La Lydie et le Monde Grec au Temps des Mermnades* (Paris, 1893), pp. 87, 90, 91; for the land system in Pontus and Cappadocia, Th. Reinach, *Mithradates Eupator* (German translation, Leipzig, 1895), pp. 14, 17, 235–236, and Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Königreichs Pontos* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 17.

[44] Max Weber, article "Agrargeschichte" in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 71, 73–80. This remarkable article contains the best survey of the combined political-economic development of antiquity that we have. It is indispensable to anyone who wishes to gain a thorough understanding of ancient economic problems and is the source of many of the ideas here presented.

[45] Weber, in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 85.

[46] *Ibid.,* p. 88.

[47] *Ibid.,* p. 80.

mands of the local governors for taxation, which was paid in produce.[48] As this economic system set and became rigid, the culture of the ancient Oriental world had become traditional and stereotyped. The result of the system was spiritual monotony and intellectual anemia.

Granting that Eduard Meyer[49] has overemphasized the modernness of the industrial character of Greek and Roman economic life, the fact remains that his interpretation is, in its larger aspects, the correct one and the essential basis for any further discussion of the subject.[50] It may be best to avoid misunderstanding in dealing with ancient Greek industry by abjuring the use of the terms "factory" and "factory hands", the connotations of which are so irretrievably modern. These reservations do not at all change the fact that we have in the Greek world, from about 700 B.C., the development of cities with a wide expansion of industry and transmarine trade between the far-spread Hellenic city-states such as, quantitatively, the world had never before seen.

The articles for export, especially vases, were made in the Hellenic industrial centres of the period from 700 B.C. in "manufactories". The "manufactory" was the workroom of some wealthy man who was often an importer of raw products. The part of his supply which he might not sell to free artisans was worked into form for the local or export market in his *ergasterion* by bought or rented slaves.[51] The free artisans, too, whether working singly or in a group, at home or in a small shop, were certainly manufacturing for export as well as for local trade.

Recent archaeological activity and the scientific analysis of the vase types found in various parts of the Mediterranean world are gradually leading to an accurate and unassailable knowledge of the general spread of trade of the Hellenic city-states and the special spheres of certain industrial cities, as well as the overlapping of the trade of one city into the sphere of another.[52] The increasingly com-

[48] Weber, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 125.

[49] In his "Wirtschaftliche Entwickelung des Altertums", in *Kleine Schriften,* p. 79 ff.

[50] For an excellent summary of the discussion between Eduard Meyer and the economists, Rodbertus and Karl Bücher, see again Weber's article, already so often cited, upon "Agrargeschichte" in the *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 54 ff. Compare also the *exkurs* at the end of Kurt Riezler's excellent study, *Ueber Finanzen und Monopole im alten Griechenland* (Berlin, 1907).

[51] See Max Weber, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 56.

[52] Hugo Prinz in his article "Funde aus Naukratis", in *Klio: Beiträge zur alten Geschichte,* VII. Beiheft, has given a remarkable picture of the export trade in pottery from the Greek city-states.

mercial character of the external politics of the Greek states after 700 B.C. is a result of this free and active competition.[53] Other characteristics of the commerce and industry of the "classic period" are the rapid spread of the use of commodity money and a very large relative increase in the size of cities. The Hellenic world, however, developed very unevenly in this respect and the industrial cities were largely confined to the coastal areas. Central-western Greece, Epirus, and Macedon did not share in the industrial evolution until later. Nor did the use of coinage in exchange ever develop in antiquity to the point of superseding entirely exchange and payment in *naturalia*.[54] Yet the outstanding characteristics of the Hellenic world at its height, as compared with the economic world which preceded it and that which followed the decline of ancient civilization, are these: (1) large cities; (2) manufactories in these cities whose output was destined and used for a widespread export trade; (3) the use of commodity money in exchange.

The Greek system of land tenure shows a freedom of alienation commensurate with the freedom of trade and industry, except in those states which, like Thessaly and Sparta, were directly organized on the strict basis of a land-holding citizen army and in which the citizen allotments were theoretically inalienable. Despite the fact that the citizen army of Athens in the fifth century was largely a corps of free peasantry, enrollment in the demes was even then quite independent of calling or domicile. Ownership of land was no longer essential for deme registration.[55]

It was under such conditions of economic freedom that the Hellenic world developed its remarkable civilization, distinguished by that intensity of individual expression which still impresses us as so singular and so inspiring. In the fourth century, during the exhausting period of the inter-state wars, the insufficiency of the city-state financial policy, along with other causes, began to produce results ominous for the future Greek economic life. In order to cover the extraordinary expenditures incident upon continental wars, the city-states began to alienate their domains and those of the temples and to sink in the wars the surplus in gold and silver objects deposited as offerings in the temples. Working upon the ancient theory of the supremacy of the state, by confiscation of the property of the wealthy and the sale of their lands the states made insecure what had been the safest sphere of investment of capital,

[53] Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 104–116.

[54] Ludwig Mitteis, *Aus den Griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Leipzig, 1900), p. 26.

[55] Max Weber, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, I. 112–115.

namely, the soil. The exercise of the sovereign right of the states in establishing bank monopolies hindered the promising development of private banks, such as were springing up in Athens. The difficulty of the food supply for the cities, continually growing in size, in a land which was dependent upon imported food-stuffs, became increasingly apparent. Capitalism had not yet grown to a degree that enabled private enterprise to cope with this problem. Indeed the lack of highly developed transportation facilities and the insufficiency of private capitalistic enterprise backed by a system of state credits, made the question of the city food supply one of the most serious which faced the Graeco-Roman world throughout its ancient history. The governments were forced into the grain business as the greatest entrepreneur. Competition with the state, which could fix prices as the needs of the case might demand, was difficult for the small grain dealer. The growing signs of the inefficiency of the Hellenic city-state financial policy in the fourth century, its inability to establish a sound state credit, its attempts to help itself over hard times by establishing temporary monopolies, and the disastrous results of such a policy upon the security and vitality of private enterprise, are well stated by Riezler in his pamphlet upon Greek finances and monopolies.[56]

Into the civilization of the Persian Empire an entirely new idea was projected when Alexander and his successors founded cities after the Greek model at the junctures of the great highways from the Nile River to India. The heart of each of these city-states was the group of Macedonian and Greek soldiers, officials, and merchants, who formed the citizen body. The native population was herded in from the villages round about. So the cities arose quickly by the Greek process of *synoecism*. Their business ideals and methods must, at first, have been entirely those of Greece. From the outset, therefore, we have two antagonistic political and economic principles pitted against each other—on the one hand the Oriental serf-state working under a system of natural economy, on the other the Greek city-state with its coinage system and its traditions of political and industrial freedom.

The greatest administrative question which confronted the suc-

[56] Kurt Riezler, *Ueber Finanzen und Monopole im alten Griechenland.* Undoubtedly many causes combined to bring about the disorganization in the Greek city-states of the Greek peninsula and Asia Minor in the fourth and third centuries. Riezler has emphasized those causes inherent in the political construction and theory of the city-state, and in its financial policy. The continual wars and the decline of the western trade, due to the growth of manufacturing in the West, must have been powerful elements in producing the economic troubles in Greece itself.

cessors of Alexander in western Asia and Egypt was that of the conduct of their immense royal domains. The inscriptions give us their divergent answers to the problem. The Seleucids sold off large tracts of the royal domain, including the *laoi,* or peasants, and their possessions, to private persons or to cities, granting to the purchaser full title.[57] These alienated estates were then attached to some city-state and enrolled upon its land register. The new land-barons took up their residence in the castles formerly occupied by the Iranian nobles, or dwelt in the cities as absentee landlords. The Persian form of land tenure was not materially changed by this innovation. As to the agricultural laborers it is presumable that, even upon the great estates privately owned, they were still serfs, but now city-state serfs instead of royal serfs,[58] enrolled on the registers of the city-states instead of the registers of the royal domain. They had no legal freedom of changing their domicile, but were definitely attached, for purposes of taxation and administration, to their native villages.[59]

The information upon the agrarian and industrial history of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt is, thanks to the papyri, much more definite and satisfactory than that for western Asia. Under the Ptolemies all the land of Egypt belonged to the sovereign. It was divided, for purposes of administration, into *Ge Basilike,* or royal domain, and *Ge en Aphesei,* or land under grant. The royal domain was worked directly by the crown by means of royal peasants, *Basilikoi Georgoi.* The land under grant was worked by subjects who had possession, but not absolute ownership.[60] It is necessary to fix clearly the fact that the ownership of all land in Egypt rested with the ruler,[61] and that the mass of the native subject population, both the royal peasants and those who worked the lands under grant for their leaseholders, were increasingly bound to their villages, to their agricultural duties, and certain villein services due to the state.[62]

57 Rostowzew, *Römischer Kolonat,* pp. 248–251. The chief inscriptions are those published in Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones,* nos. 221, 225, 335, 336. To these is to be added the interesting and important inscription from Sardes published by Buckler and Robinson in the *American Journal of Archaeology,* XVI. 11 ff. (1912).

58 Rostowzew, *Römischer Kolonat,* p. 254.

59 Max Weber, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 129. The source of this decision is the Laodice document, Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones,* no. 225.

60 Wilcken, *Papyruskunde, Grundzüge* (Leipzig, 1912), I. 1, p. 271 ff.

61 *Ibid.,* pp. 270–272; Rostowzew, *Kolonat,* p. 79.

62 Weber, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 129.

Highly characteristic of the administrative industrial policy of the Ptolemaic régime is the development of state monopolies. In the Greek city-states of the fourth century these had been temporary expedients, employed in time of need. Under the absolutistic rule of the Ptolemies the monopolies of the state were continuous, carried on in the interest of the fiscus, and covering some of the most important branches of industry.[63] The oil monopoly included a monopoly of production, manufacture, and sale of oil. The banking system, also, was a complete state monopoly. In many other fields the king either had a complete monopoly or appeared as a powerful competitor to private enterprise. So the Ptolemaic king, like the ancient Pharaoh, appears as the greatest manufacturer in Egypt and the greatest merchant.[64]

That part of the population of Egypt which worked upon the royal domains or in the royal manufactories and all those who worked under any form of lease from the state, comprised a distinct class, distinguished in the papyri as "those involved in the royal revenues". The actual laborers in the monopolies were direct serfs of the state and the royal peasants rapidly tended to become serfs. Both alike were bound to the places at which they worked, and were punished if they removed from that place.[65] The royal peasants might at any time be called upon for compulsory labor on canals, in the state mines, or upon the royal transport ships.

Such is the picture of the economic and social situation in western Asia and Egypt when these lands were brought within the Roman Empire. In Asia Minor there were great royal domains, which the Roman state inherited, together with manorial estates and city-state territories. The mass of the agricultural population worked the land in a condition which certainly bordered on serfdom. In Egypt there was the state, the all-powerful Ptolemy at the top, holding an absolute monopoly of the land and of many lines of industry, and appearing as a strong competitor to private enterprise in other lines. Below him stood a middle class, including priests, soldiers, and large leaseholders, who were already growing to be a semi-official body. Below them was the great mass of the Egyptian peasantry and laborers. Imposed upon this social structure in the eastern lands were the Greek city-state foundations, with their free political life, free at least in their local activities, bringing with them the traditions of the old Greek freedom of commerce and

[63] For the most comprehensive statement which we yet have of the number of Ptolemaic monopolies see Wilcken, *Papyruskunde, Grundzüge*, I. 1, p. 239 ff.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

[65] Rostowzew, *Römischer Kolonat*, p. 66.

industry. The wealthy men of these cities were absentee landlords whose estates lay within the city-state territory. For the taxes from these estates they were responsible. The Hellenistic period is further characterized by a continual increase in the use of commodity money as opposed to exchange in *naturalia*.

The agrarian history of the Roman Republic is too well known to require anything more than a reminding sketch. On the one hand appeared the tendency toward the building of large estates, which was founded in the system of leasing the *ager publicus*. Against this tendency stood the insistent democratic legislation which worked toward the division of the farm lands of Italy among the veteran colonists of the Roman citizen body and the Italian alliance under Rome's hegemony. This struggle to maintain the old freedom of general disposal of the state lands carried with it an attempt to put a limit to the use of slaves on the Italian estates. The story of the failure of the democratic land policy in the second century B.C. need not be repeated. The reasons for the defeat of the citizen peasant and the small farmer are well known.[66] In the first century B.C. the mischief was already done. A few great landowners ruled the state and some part of the old peasantry had become impoverished proletariate. In 104 B.C. a political leader at Rome asserted that there were not 2000 men in the state who had property.[67]

The annexation of Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Spain and the adoption of the principles of the agrarian policies of Sicily and Carthage undoubtedly had a powerful influence upon the development already mentioned in Italy. In Sicily under the Syracusan hegemony a unified and simple system had been adopted in which all the land, whether city-state territory or royal domain, was treated alike. The sovereignty of the state was pre-eminent, all subjects were regarded as *Georgoi*, and all paid the tithe from their lands, just as the royal domains did.[68] In this system the city-states had become administrative units in the process of bringing in the *tributum*. All the landholders of Sicily were regarded by the Romans as "*coloni* and peasants of the Roman people".

Upon the great African and Sicilian estates the laborers were

[66] The correction of the current idea that slave labor entirely drove out free agricultural labor in Italy will be found in the careful and convincing study of Herman Gummerus, "Der Römische Gutsbetrieb als Wirtschaftlicher Organismus", in *Klio: Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, V. Beiheft (Leipzig, 1906). Poor small farmers continued to maintain themselves throughout the republican period, p. 62.

[67] The capitalistic leader Philippus, in Cicero, *De Officiis*, II. 73.

[68] Rostowzew, *Römischer Kolonat*, p. 234.

largely slaves during the period of the Roman Republic. Free labor was used chiefly at the time of the harvest. In the West, therefore, the small farmer and agricultural laborer was forced into the city, there to seek subsistence in the city's industrial life or to swell the numbers of the poverty-stricken city proletariate. The founding of agricultural colonies as an outlet for this element had practically ceased after the defeat of the Gracchan legislation. The problem of feeding this element of the city population added to the difficulty, always so apparent in antiquity, of the city food supply.

During the first century and a half of the Roman Empire the Greek policy of city foundations spread into the West. With their growth manufactories arose. Their industrial life and financial system were those of the Hellenistic cities. For the taxes and liturgies demanded by the government the well-to-do citizens, chiefly the owners and lessees of agricultural estates, were held responsible.[69] The *pax Romana* of the early imperial period closed the sources of the supply of cheap slaves. The numbers of the slaves decreased in agricultural labor because the prices paid for them rose so high that their use became economically disadvantageous.[70] In the households of the wealthy, slaves still appear, of course; but they are luxuries which could only be afforded for personal service by the rich. In the industries slave artisans were still used side by side with free skilled laborers, as capitalistic investments of their owners to whom the proceeds of their labor went.[71]

Beside the increase in the number of cities and their population, appears an immense increase in the imperial domains in the first century of our era. Those private estates which survived also grew to large proportions. But the smaller estates and leaseholds began to disappear rapidly. The place of slave labor upon these domains and great estates is taken by the *coloni,* who work the soil under a form of sub-lease for private owners or large leaseholders. The pressure upon them is always greater and the application of the doctrine of *origo,* the doctrine that they must remain fixed to the place of their registration upon the state books for the fulfillment of their services, is increasingly more strict.[72] This theory is applied by the

[69] Rostowzew, in his article upon the "Kolonat", in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* V. 918.

[70] Max Weber in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* I. 179.

[71] Herman Gummerus in *Klio,* XIV. 317. This article is an extremely careful organization and analysis of the materials extant upon the jewelry and metal trades. The studies promised by Gummerus upon other special lines of trade will be awaited with great interest.

[72] For this development in Egypt see Rostowzew, *Römischer Kolonat,* p. 226; for northern Africa, *ibid.,* p. 227.

state upon the big private *latifundia* as well as upon the imperial domains which the government leased to the *conductores*. These leaseholders, who during the first century were absentee landlords living in the cities, were responsible to the state for the rentals, whether in money or produce, and the government sacrificed to them the *coloni*, or sub-lessees. The results upon the volume of agricultural production could not be otherwise than bad; and this is clearly apparent in the imperial legislation of the end of the first and the course of the second century.

The first of the Roman emperors to legislate against this vicious trend of affairs was, in all probability, Vespasian,[73] who was the grandson of a minor tax official and son of a money lender. From the time of the Flavians to that of Caracalla we have imperial decrees upon the relations of the *coloni*, or small-leaseholders and the actual peasants, to the large-leaseholders (*conductores*) and the great private landlords. This legislation speaks eloquently of the decline in production, the waste lands, and abandoned lands. It attempted to protect the *coloni* from oppression by the big leaseholders and private possessors. It tried to encourage them to bring under cultivation the abandoned fields. But in so doing it drew the bands more tightly about the *coloni*. To meet the oppression of the big landlords the state fixed the amount of produce the *colonus* was to pay to the landlord and the number of days of his obligatory services, on the imperial domains and private domains alike. And that he might be assured the rights which the state guaranteed him he was forced to dwell within the domain.

The system of leasing the public domains spread into Spain, Gaul, and the lands along the Danube. The state mines were also handled in the same way and here, too, by the time of Hadrian the *coloni* had displaced the slave labor formerly employed.[74] In this inability of the imperial administration to re-establish in the East a strong free peasantry, quantitatively and materially strong, and to maintain the old free peasantry in the West, lie the basic causes first of the economic, then of the intellectual decline of the Graeco-Roman civilization. Three results of this inefficiency to meet a great problem are clear and definite.

1. Its great result was the decline in intellectual vigor of the great agrarian population. For the free peasant of Italy and the West in general became a work-tool of the state and the great landowners, a work-tool bound to the place where it was needed. Pri-

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 325–336.

[74] J. B. Mispoulet, "Le Régime des Mines à l'Époque Romaine et au Moyen Age", in *Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit*, pp. 345–391, 491–537 (1907).

vate enterprise and initiative disappeared and the conditions which arose were those already depicted for the end of the Pharaonic régime in Egypt and the Persian Empire in western Asia. In this process the agricultural slavery in the West had undoubtedly played its part.

2. As the Roman Empire passed from its small estates, worked by slave and free labor, to its great imperial and private domains, the number of the free agricultural "production units" declined enormously. Consequent upon the decline in the number of these production units came a great decrease in productivity and the tax-paying power of a given acreage of land. Consequently the state, in order to meet its regular and increasing demands for taxes, was forced to press upon the *decuriones,* who were the great leaseholders or land capitalists resident in the city-states. Under the ancient theory of state liturgies they, too, were bound to their city-state by the doctrine of *origo.* Early in the third century the *decuriones* undoubtedly could be forced by the state to return to the city-state of their *origo* with which their obligations to the state were bound.[75] Thus, in the third century, the middle class, too, was forced to the wall under the weight of its liturgical obligations and the lesser estates fell away more and more and helped to swell the vast domains of single land barons who were strong enough to resist the pressure and force immunities from the government.

3. The establishment of the colonate brought about the economic ruin of the industrial city. It must be remembered that the background of the high civilization of the Greek world was the city-state with its manufactories and its political and economic freedom. This civilization and the industrial city out of which it grew were the heritage of the Roman world. Outside of its Eastern trade and a much smaller volume of trade with the Germans, the empire had no other foreign spheres of consumption. The bulk of the city production must be consumed within the empire. The welfare of that form of economic order, therefore, depended upon the possibility of selling the city production to a wide-spread capacity to buy. And the consumers must necessarily be the country population. The colonate, however, had destroyed the consumption power of the country districts through the vast shrinkage in the free units of production.[76] This eventually led to the abandonment of the cities, which lost in attractiveness as their industrial vigor decayed.[77] The debasement of the imperial coinage in the second and third

[75] Max Weber, *Römische Agrargeschichte,* p. 256.
[76] Ludwig Mitteis, *Aus den Griechischen Papyrusurkunden,* p. 34.
[77] Weber, *Römische Agrargeschichte,* p. 262.

centuries is undoubtedly to be regarded as an administrative effort to meet, by temporary expedients, the conditions arising from the great economic disturbances just depicted.

In the second century the reversion began from an industrial life based on a wide use of coinage to the more primitive conditions of payments in kind and exchange of produce.[78] In the third century the signs of this reversion are much more marked. The big estates again took up the manufacture of the goods which they needed. So the great epoch of the industrial city-state is past and with it "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome".

What I have tried to do is to show that it was the loss of economic freedom, even more than the loss of political freedom, which had such disastrous results upon private initiative and finally undermined the ancient Graeco-Roman civilization. I am not unaware that other causes beside those I have enumerated played their rôle in this great historic tragedy. Among those which may be suggested are the spread of city-state and imperial monopolies;[79] the lack of a state system of credits commensurate with and able to support the intricate and relatively highly organized industrial and commercial life of the empire; and the problem of the city food-supply. These questions, like many others in this field of work, are still open to investigation.

W. L. Westermann.

[78] As Rostowzew has pointed out (*Römischer Kolonat*, p. 369), it was quite natural that the *coloni*, who lived in a situation of natural economy and were for the greater part poor, should pay in kind rather than in money.

[79] Under the Roman Empire in Egypt, for example, the state monopolies of the Ptolemies were continued. In my judgment the imperial *cura annonae*, or care of the grain supply, must be handled in connection with private enterprise in the transportation and consumption of grain. A beginning of this form of treatment is to be found in Rostowzew's article upon *frumentum* in the Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyklopädie*. The Roman emperors were the great grain-dealers of their world.

MAGNA CARTA AND THE RESPONSIBLE MINISTRY[1]

As was naturally to be expected, the conclusion reached in my *Origin of the English Constitution* has not found universal acceptance. In that book I maintained that what is distinctive in the English constitution, what has given it its unique place in the history of the world, that is, the principle and the constitutional machinery of a limited monarchy, was derived directly from the principles and practices introduced by Magna Carta, and that therefore the origin of the English constitution is to be found in Magna Carta. In dissent it has been declared that the English constitution contains far more than the machinery of a limited monarchy. As I have anticipated this criticism in the book and explained with reference to it the sense in which I use the term constitution, I do not consider that the objection, put in this form, needs further discussion. It has been put in more specific form, however, by Dr. McKechnie in the second edition of his *Magna Carta.* He implies, justly I think, that I have not shown the connection with the development begun by Magna Carta of one of the most important features of the present constitution, the responsible ministry. Dr. McKechnie says:

> The main line by which that monarchy has progressed from medieval to modern ideals has not been by the method, unsuccessfully attempted in 1215, 1244, 1258, 1265 and 1311 (to name only the best known instances), of subjecting the King to the dictation of a Committee of his adversaries; but rather the method of using the counsellors of his own appointment to curb his own caprice, while making it progressively difficult for him to appoint any minister of whom the national council did not approve.[2]

The same point has been put in another way in a private letter which

[1] This article is published as a contribution to the observance of the seventh centennial of Magna Carta. In its preparation I have made a special use of the following books and articles and would here acknowledge my indebtedness to them: Sir William R. Anson, *The Law and Custom of the Constitution,* I. 39–43 (1909), vol. II., ch. II. (1907); H. B. Learned, *The President's Cabinet* (1912), chs. I., II., III.; Sir William R. Anson, *English Historical Review,* XXIX, 56–78, 325–327; E. I. Carlyle, *ibid.,* XXVII. 251–273; H. W. V. Temperley, *ibid.* XXVII. 682–699; XXVIII. 127–131; E. R. Turner, American Historical Review, XVIII. 751–768; XIX. 27–43, 772–794. The articles of Carlyle, Temperley, and Turner are concerned mainly with external forms, or the development of the cabinet. Sir William Anson considers more fully the idea of responsibility and Mr. Learned's book is valuable in the same direction.

[2] W. S. McKechnie, *Magna Carta* (1914), p. 127.

I have received from a professor of history in one of our principal universities. He says:

> The principle of Magna Carta that the King personally is subject to the law and can be coerced if he breaks it is not the principle of the constitution to-day. Just when and how was the modern principle that the King can do no wrong, coupled with the responsibility of his ministers to the law, substituted for it?

My critics plainly assume that the principle of ministerial responsibility originated outside the line of results derivable from Magna Carta, and one of them believes that it has taken the place in the present constitution of the principle that the king is subject to the law. The question thus raised is a most important one. Ministerial responsibility has played so great a part in the practical operation of the English constitution for more than a century; it seems to the student of the nineteenth century so clearly of the very nature of the constitution and even appears to be its one essential feature; it has had so much to do with making possible the adoption of the constitution more or less completely by all kinds of monarchies, from those that are virtually democratic republics to those that are scarcely modified absolutisms, that certainly no understanding of English constitutional history is complete until the source of that principle and the way in which it entered into the final result are clear.

There can be no doubt that an idea of ministerial responsibility is to be found in the Middle Ages and that it was to a considerable extent realized in fact. In the passage from which I have quoted, Dr. McKechnie enumerates by date the first clumsy experiments which were made in the effort to give institutional expression to the principle that the king may be compelled to keep the law. They were blind gropings after the idea of ministerial responsibility, so vaguely conceived that no one saw a better way than to remove entirely the ministers of the king's appointment, or even to suspend the king's authority itself, and substitute for the time being ministers, or a kind of commission, directly responsible to the great council. Dr. McKechnie has seen clearly enough that modern ministerial responsibility did not grow out of these first instances, but they are by no means the only efforts during the Middle Ages to find some pacific, non-revolutionary method of enforcing royal respect for the law. The rapid growth of parliamentary power between 1310 and 1360, for only the faintest beginning had been made by 1310, introduced a new element into the situation. Not

merely had Parliament in the interval greatly enlarged the body of law which the king was required to observe,[3] but it had so perfected its own organization and won for itself so clearly a definite place in the constitution, that it was prepared to take charge with great efficiency of the enforcement of the king's obligations, in place of the somewhat unorganized and inconsistent baronial opposition.[4] To my mind it is indispensable to any understanding of the formation of the English constitution to see that although the development of Parliament down to this point was independent of the line of development begun by Magna Carta, what took place shortly after the middle of the fourteenth century was the assumption by Parliament of the supervision of that line of development.[5] What Parliament did in its first efforts to control the ministers of Edward III. was not something new in principle, nor a change of purpose, but it was to employ a new method of putting the old principle into operation. That a great advance was made at this point is beyond doubt, but the advance did not consist in the introduction of any new principle, nor indeed in any clearer perception or better formulation of the old, but in the better method which came into use through the higher organization of the body which assumed charge and the possibility of a more continuous and consistent growth.

The method employed from this time on in the coercion of the king was no longer to appoint over him a "committee of his adversaries", but to hold the ministers of the king's own appointment re-

[3] The body of law to which the king was held subject had undoubtedly been much changed by the decline of feudalism and much enlarged by the development of national life, and especially by the principles referred to above, established in the growth of Parliament's power, but the continued influence of the fundamental principle of Magna Carta was assured by its simplicity and its adaptability to the changing conditions of social advance. See *Origin of the English Constitution*, pp. 157, 169, note.

[4] See *Origin*, pp. 157–167. With this compare Dr. Gaillard Lapsley in the *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 124 (1913), in a "note" on the "Commons and the Statute of York". Dr. Lapsley, I think, dates the beginning of parliamentary supervision somewhat too early. It seems probable that the power of Parliament was too undeveloped before the last years of Edward III. to permit of any continuous guardianship of constitutional principles. The date is more clearly marked by the beginning of impeachment than by any other single fact.

[5] Parliament laid the foundation for this assumption early in the fourteenth century in its efforts to obtain financial control, and it is surely not necessary to emphasize the important place given to this control, so far as recognized by the law of that day, in 1215 and in the actual practice of the thirteenth century. Nor is it necessary to point out that this control was definitely restored to the formal tradition of Magna Carta in 1297. It should, however, not be overlooked that upon this restoration was definitely based the first slight step in parliamentary development in the grants upon conditions at the beginning of the reign of Edward II., and that upon this last was directly founded the whole construction of parliamentary power in the reign of Edward III.

sponsible to Parliament for what they did in carrying out his policy or, if in some cases Parliament appointed, it was not with any special purpose of selecting the leaders of an active opposition. The new method is to be seen in the history of the treasurers during the last years of Edward III.'s reign, in the control of the councils of Richard II.'s minority and of the three Lancastrian reigns, and most perfectly of all in the process of impeachment. But however modern the description may sound which may be given of this new method, it is really distinguished from the modern and identified with the medieval by two most essential characteristics. In the first place it is the king who is coerced and not the ministers. The real executive is the king and the ministers are punished as a means of coercing him. Parliament has as yet no conception of itself as the final authority in determining the policy of the government, or of the ministers as carrying out its policy rather than the king's. In the second place, Parliament holds the ministers to a direct responsibility to itself. It compels them to report to itself, it brings criminal accusations against them, and punishes them with death. The modern indirect responsibility is not thought of. These two differences reveal an impassable gulf between the modern and the medieval forms of ministerial responsibility. The first indicates a vitally important difference of purpose and interpretation, and the second an institutional difference, in the mechanical operation of the principle, which alone would make its derivation from the earlier impossible.[6] Modern ministerial responsibility has nothing in common with medieval beyond the name and the mere idea. Undoubtedly the abstract idea is the same, but constitutional history does not concern itself with abstract ideas, except to note them as

[6] If, however, any one is convinced that the modern is derived from the medieval form, it should not be difficult to see its direct connection with Magna Carta. As I have said above, the methods of coercion and control adopted in the last half of the fourteenth century and continued in the fifteenth, rest back for their foundation upon the principles brought into the constitution in 1215. They are merely improved methods of doing the same thing that was attempted in 1258 and 1310. This is true even of impeachment, the medieval expedient which passes on into modern times, for its object was not to transfer the initiative and control of government policy from the king to his ministers; that was an idea still in the far distant future and impossible to the fourteenth century. It was merely a new and improved method of coercing the king. If the modern were derived from the medieval, its origin would be far more conscious and deliberate than it was, and we should be able to discover the stages of change. It may be added that in the fourteenth century also the use of the counsellors of the king's own appointment to curb his caprice, and the making of it difficult for him to appoint any minister of whom the national council did not approve were still in the distant future.

sources of suggestion and impulse.[7] It deals with the institutional forms in which ideas are expressed and the way in which these institutions operate in the daily carrying on of government. In these particulars, in the matter of ministerial responsibility, a great change occurred somewhere between the fifteenth and the nineteenth centuries.[8]

Not merely in institutional form but in practical result, it is difficult to overstate the importance of this difference. Had the course of English history led to a constitution in which in form and law the ministry was directly responsible to Parliament instead of to the king, not merely would it have been immensely more difficult to reconcile the sovereign to a loss of the substance of power, but the adoption of the constitution by other and reluctant monarchies would have been made a practical impossibility. The compromise feature of the present constitution would have had no existence. The choice which in that case a successful revolution might offer to a sovereign between a formal direct responsibility of all the organs of actual government to the legislative assembly on one side, and an out-and-out republic on the other, would have had no particular significance. The world influence of the English constitution depended for its existence upon the fact that Parliament came to control the actual government indirectly, not directly; that an actual republic was concealed under all the ceremonial and theoretical forms of a continued monarchy.[9]

[7] The influence upon constitutional history of John Locke's attempt to find a philosophical justification for the Revolution of 1688 in his second *Treatise on Government* was great in both France and America, but this fact does not make Locke's *Treatise* in itself considered a part of constitutional history.

[8] What binds together in this respect the development of the English constitution from its beginning in 1215 to the latest step which has been taken in it, is the effort to find some means of holding the king responsible without the danger of civil war and revolution. It is really this common characteristic, so far as we are not deceived by the mere name, which tempts us to identify medieval with modern ministerial responsibility, not the existence of a true institutional identity, for that is usually assumed without investigation.

[9] I have said much on ministerial responsibility as aiding in the spread of the English constitution throughout the world and accounting for its influence. I have no wish to modify these statements, but it must be noticed that they apply rather to the influence of the constitution in the nineteenth century than earlier. The practical experience of the Continent, especially of France, with absolutism, and the effort which was made by the French philosophers to attack the theoretical foundation of an absolute monarchy, aided by the results reached in England, especially by Locke, in attempting to justify philosophically the revolution of the seventeenth century, gave to the English constitution an influence in the eighteenth century which is derived from the general fact of limited monarchy, with comparatively little reference to the special institutional forms in which the fact was expressed. This is to be seen in the purely theoretical way in which, both in France and America, institutional details were discussed, and even experimented with, with no reference to the experience of England.

To show how the newer form of ministerial responsibility entered the constitution, a brief outline of the middle period of its history is necessary, and this will also show, as I believe, the historical independence of the modern principle of the medieval experiments and its organic relation with the fundamental principle of Magna Carta.

If we go back to the close of the Middle Ages, or better to the beginning of the seventeenth century, for at the close of the Middle Ages proper the accumulation of precedent essential in the final result was not complete, we shall find, as is well known, an impossible constitutional situation. At the accession of James I., there was upon one side a great body of history and precedent in support of the king's claim to govern by his own will. At the same date, there was upon the other side a great body of history and precedent in support of Parliament's claim that the king was bound to regard a certain body of law and custom in his action.[10] This situation may be described in other terms which bring out more clearly its relation to our theme. England of the twelfth century was an absolute monarchy with no constitutional limitation except that vaguely implied in the fundamental contract of feudalism, and no machinery for the expression of a will opposed to that of the king except the primitive and ineffective curia regis. The natural development of this absolute monarchy into a final constitution was broken into by Magna Carta which transformed the feudal interpretation of the contract relationship between the king and his barons into a general principle (the king may be compelled to keep the law) capable of far wider application and of expansion without change of substance to fit the needs of the expanding national life. From the date of Magna Carta on to the beginning of the seventeenth century, the two currents of constitutional development thus begun appear alternately upon the surface. The principles of a limited monarchy are

[10] In addition there had appeared in the sixteenth century an important development of theory in support of such a claim in the idea of the divine right of the king. Theoretical support for Parliament's position was much less clearly developed at the beginning of the seventeenth century than for the king's, and a most interesting part of the history of that century is the gradual formation of this theory. This comes, I think, to its first full and clear expression in the resolutions of January 4, 1649, justifying the action of the House of Commons in proceeding single-handed with the trial of the king: "That the people are, under God, the original of all just power; that the Commons of England, in Parliament assembled, being chosen by and representing the people, have the supreme power in this nation; that whatsoever is enacted or declared for law by the Commons in Parliament assembled, hath the force of law, and all the people of this nation are concluded thereby, although the consent and concurrence of King or House of Peers be not had thereunto." Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, IV. 290.

enlarging and clarifying themselves until they are virtually complete in the fifteenth century, and the absolute monarchy is forced constantly into narrower channels by the concessions it must every now and then make to the increased weight of the opposing current. Down to the death of Elizabeth, however, much the larger portion of the past had been occupied by practical absolutism, while, except in the granting of taxes and in legislation, the limited monarchy existed rather in undeveloped principles. But these principles were so truly the result of experiment and experience that an imposing body of precedent could also be cited to justify their expansion in new applications.[11]

These two contradictory interpretations of the constitution stood over against one another in 1603. The issue between them had never been drawn. Since the working out of the limited monarchy and the establishment of its principles in 1399,[12] the two had never entered the field together. Each in turn had had possession for a long period, and government had been carried on according to it with no serious interruption from the other. The Lancastrian period, "startlingly and prematurely modern", is in fundamental principles, though these had not been worked out in all details, an age of constitutional monarchy. The Yorkist and Tudor periods form an age of practical absolutism, though an absolutism which for its own convenience made use of some of the machinery of a

[11] See an interesting instance of the citation of precedents on this side quoted by Taswell-Langmead, *English Constitutional History* (seventh ed., 1911), p. 432, and there attributed to Sir Robert Cotton: "We do not desire, as 5 Henry IV., or 29 Henry VI., the removing from about the King any evil councillors. We do not request a choice by name, as 14 Edward II., 3, 5, 11 Richard II., 8 Henry IV., or 31 Henry VI.; nor to swear them in Parliament, as 35 Edward I., 9 Edward II., or 5 Richard II.; or to line them out their directions of rule, as 43 Henry III. and 8 Henry VI.; or desire that which Henry III. did promise in his 42nd year, *se acta omnia per assensum magnatum de concilio suo electorum, et sine eorum assensu nihil.*" On the attribution of this speech and the question of its delivery see S. R. Gardiner, *Debates in the House of Commons in 1625* (Camden Society, 1873), pp. xx–xxiii, and *History of England*, V. 425, note (ten-vol. ed., 1883), and *cf.* Forster, *Sir John Eliot* (1872), pp. 243–250. If it be true that "this speech was not spoken but intended", the sentence is still a good example of the way in which precedents were used on the parliamentary side.

[12] It is no exaggeration to say that after the Revolution of 1399 the English constitution was in existence so far as all its fundamental principles are concerned. Much had still to be done in finding out all that those principles implied and this was the work of the seventeenth century; much had still to be done in applying them consistently to the details of government, especially in the control of finance, in the independence of the judiciary, and in the directing of foreign policy; and much had still to be done in devising machinery for their practical operation, and of this the chief instance is the cabinet with ministerial responsibility.

constitutional monarchy and in so doing strengthened and confirmed it.

With the accession of James I. we enter upon a period of constitutional growth new in character to all English history, if we except the brief struggle under Richard II. On his side the king was determined that the constitution should be operated according to his interpretation of it and on its side Parliament was equally determined that its interpretation should prevail. From such an issue only two results were possible. It might be that one interpretation should prevail to the exclusion of the other, or it might be that a workable compromise should be found between them. It is not necessary for our purpose to follow the struggle between these conflicting ideals; it is necessary to see that the result was a workable compromise between them of which the essential feature was destined in the end to be the modern responsible ministry.

Let us state the result with reference to 1660 and following years, rather than with reference to the past. The struggle with Charles I. established finally and forever the principle that actual sovereignty, the right and power of ultimate decision, was vested in Parliament as representing the nation. How completely this fundamental question had been decided in Parliament's favor is revealed by the unanimity, almost without exception, with which the nation rallied to the support of that decision when the final test came in 1688. But although this was the result established in reality, it was not the result established in form. Parliament was not able, or did not wish, to render permanent all that the Puritan party had accomplished, or felt itself obliged to attempt, in the change of government forms. The last period of the Protectorate saw a strong reaction in favor of the monarchy as the historical and natural government of the state, and the result was the restoration of the Stuarts without constitutional guarantees.[13] In form such a settlement left the issue between the two conflicting constitutional interpretations of 1603 undecided. In reality it had been decided in favor of the parliamentary interpretation, and Charles II. was perhaps even more conscious of this fact than was Parliament itself.[14]

[13] This is of course the great difference between the settlement of 1660 and that of 1668–1669. The experience of the intervening years convinced the nation that the king must be far more definitely and specifically bound than ever before to a faithful observance of the fundamental public law as it then stood. The guarantees of 1688 included, however, no pledge to any form of constitutional machinery by which the sovereignty of Parliament, its right of ultimate decision, was to be practically exercised.

[14] The form in which the compromise is stated by the modern constitutional lawyer (sovereignty resides in the king in his Parliament) is exceedingly interest-

That the settlement of 1660 was a compromise needs hardly to be proved. That it was unexpressed and unnoticed, made not by negotiation but by the force of events, does not make it less truly a compromise. On one side the form was surrendered but what proved in the end to be the reality retained; on the other the reality was given up but the surrender was disguised under the appearance of power and, more than that, for a long time under the actual exercise of very substantial powers and the permanent possession of important rights and influence. It was more than a hundred years before all that the compromise implied was clearly recognized and the balance established at its present level. But the compromise was really made at the Restoration, though it was afterwards so seriously attacked by James II. that it needed to be reaffirmed in more definite form in 1689.

Constitutionally the result was something new to all the experience of history: in form sovereignty was vested in the king, in reality it was vested in Parliament, and the problem of carrying out such a settlement in practical government, though no one was conscious of it at the time, was a most serious one. Naturally, as a new thing in the world, no machinery existed by which sovereignty could be exercised in practice by a representative body while in form it remained the prerogative of the individual monarch.[15] By

ing. One is instantly reminded by it of the declaration of the Long Parliament that "the King's supreme and royal pleasure is exercised and declared in this High Court of law and council, after a more eminent and obligatory manner than it can be by personal act or resolution of his own" (Gardiner, *Documents*, p. 257). But as a formulation of the compromise of 1660, the phrase is as correct as it is interesting.

[15] The want of any machinery for carrying out in the practical working of government the compromise between king and Parliament and the difficulty of inventing satisfactory forms are clearly shown in the experimenting which went on in the reign of Charles II. as described in the books and articles referred to in note 1. Particularly interesting are some of the expedients adopted from their similarity to methods employed in Washington during the past thirty years in efforts to bring the influence of the executive to bear on legislation. See especially the passage quoted by Carlyle, *Eng. Hist Rev.*, XXVII. 260, from the *Continuation of the Life of Clarendon*, §395: "These ministers [Clarendon and Southampton] 'had every day conference with some select persons of the house of commons, who had always served the king, and upon that account had great interest in that assembly, and in regard of the experience they had and their good parts were hearkened to with reverence. And with those they consulted in what method to proceed in disposing the house, sometimes to propose, sometimes to consent to what should be most necessary to the public; and by them to assign parts to other men, whom they found disposed and willing to concur in what was to be desired: and all this without any noise, or bringing many together to design, which ever was and ever will be ingrateful to parliaments, and, however it may succeed for a little time, will in the end be attended with prejudice.'"

the mercy of Providence Charles II. possessed, probably an inheritance from his mother's house, a degree of tact and political insight which makes him an exceptional Stuart. As a consequence the fundamental contradiction was never drawn out into a square issue in his reign. When a Parliament, usually subservient, reached a point beyond which it would not go, as in the case of the Declarations of Indulgence, the king yielded, and in spite of all the practical control of government which he succeeded in gaining, the power of ultimate decision remained with Parliament. He was forced to the same conclusion to which his grandfather and father had been forced, that, if he wished to govern by his own will, he must govern without a Parliament. To the end of the reign of Charles II. there was no development of new machinery by which the compromise as to sovereignty could be carried into practical operation. As a matter of fact the compromise worked in practice imperfectly and rather because of the caution and restraint of the king than because it was clearly understood or institutionally expressed. The king chose his own ministers and controlled their policy and did not concern himself with Parliament's approval of them nor consistently with Parliament's approval of his policy, and he was still the real executive. On its side Parliament knew no way of exercising its power of final decision, except by making a square issue with the king, nor of holding the king's servant responsible except by asserting a direct responsibility enforced by the old practice of impeachment.

In the next reign the king proceeded so rapidly and with so little judgment to re-establish a personal government that the old issue was speedily drawn again and as sharply as in 1642. Only one result was possible, for practically the whole nation was determined to maintain the settlement of 1660 so far as that was a settlement of the fundamental question of the supremacy of Parliament. Had constitutional machinery been devised during the reign of Charles II. for exercising that supremacy in practice, it would undoubtedly have been included in the settlement of 1689. But it had not been, and indeed in 1689 it was only the fundamental principle of parliamentary supremacy that was in any sense apprehended. Neither the range of its application to the operation of actual government, nor the method of its application, were yet understood, nor was the latter, which is the principle of ministerial responsibility applied to the cabinet, clearly understood for another century.

With the accession of William III. we enter again upon a new epoch of English constitutional history. The fundamental question at issue between Parliament and the Stuarts, where does sovereignty

reside in the English state, had been settled never to be raised again. The most characteristic feature of the new age was not a question of fundamental principles or of general interpretation, but it was progress in devising machinery by means of which the decision of the fundamental question which had been already reached was to be put into practical operation in the details of government. No more than a beginning was made during the reign of William III. and, so far as any clear consciousness of what was really going on is concerned, there was not even a beginning. In truth considerable progress was made during that reign and the next towards what was ultimately to be the result, the responsible ministry, but the progress of the period shows itself wholly upon the side of practical affairs, not at all in ideas or understanding. William III. still retained a very decided control over the conduct of government, particularly in foreign affairs, and over the choice of ministers. He never dreamed of allowing Parliament any voice direct or indirect in this latter matter. He made a beginning, however, through practical experience upon the lesson which was more fully learned in the next reign, that the easiest way to accomplish what he desired, the line of least resistance in carrying out his policy, was to choose his chief ministers from those political leaders who were best able to secure the support of Parliament. This was a most important discovery. I am not asserting that its bearings were as yet understood. It was not as yet a matter of principle but of mere momentary convenience, but it was in truth the germ from which grew the later doctrine of ministerial responsibility with all its applications in the present constitution.[16]

This change may be described in other terms. In the reign of Charles II. impeachment, representing the old form of ministerial responsibility, was a survival, in the scientific sense of the word, destined speedily to disappear, and the new and modern form was foreshadowed on its institutional side in the experiments to find a

[16] The cabinet and the responsible ministry are coming into existence at about the same time and by parallel lines of development. The origin of the cabinet need not be here discussed, but that it can be traced, as the beginning of a continuous growth, to any period before the reign of Charles II. seems to me exceedingly doubtful. It will be understood, I think, without special discussion that the existence of a cabinet does not carry with it the idea or practice of ministerial responsibility, as it does not in the United States, and that the two are independent in origin. I must emphasize here again, however, as I have elsewhere in regard to the origin of the representative system and of taxation, the necessity of distinguishing in constitutional history between ideas and the institutions in which they are embodied, or by means of which they are operated practically. The two are often in origin and early development quite independent of one another and the failure of the historian to notice the distinction often results in unnecessary confusion and difficulty.

mediating, harmonizing body between king and Parliament. Of these Sir William Temple's proposed reorganization of the Privy Council is the most famous, but it is not the one from which the modern form developed. That came more directly from the disliked and suspected ministerial clique which the king himself formed, but rather from that as it was re-established under William III. than from Charles II.'s. The birth of the idea of ministerial responsibility on the other hand can hardly be traced back so far and is to be found coming into existence very slowly after the beginning of the eighteenth century, though the idea was in a sense involved in such an experiment as Sir William Temple's.

How wholly unconscious was the real development which was going on at that time is strikingly recorded in the Act of Settlement of the last year of William's reign. In clauses IV. and VI. of that document, as is well known, Parliament attempted to destroy the beginnings of the cabinet system in order to protect what it believed to be its means of enforcing responsibility and, if those clauses had been put into force, would have succeeded. That is to say Parliament had so little conception of how best to realize its own supremacy that it deliberately tried, in the interest of an obsolete method, to end the line of progress which was bringing in the most effective means ever devised, or apparently devisable, for operating a republic under the forms of a monarchy.

The continued ongoing of a development not understood by the statesmen of the time but showing itself more and more plainly in the facts is the most interesting feature of eighteenth-century constitutional history. The fortunate accident that foreigners came to the throne who did not know the effect of what was occurring upon their position or, if they suspected it, did not know how to prevent it, combined with the fact that statesmen and observers were equally ignorant, secured half a century of growth perfectly natural, undisturbed either by opponents or theorists. How modern the result was becoming is shown by a series of facts occurring toward the middle and end of the period, and how unnoticed it was is equally shown by the isolated character of these facts, that they were not even thought of by any one as common characteristics of a single constitutional result.[17]

[17] The first two reigns of the House of Hanover form a period more important in the development of the cabinet than of the idea of ministerial responsibility; in fact the very smoothness of cabinet development to the fall of Sir Robert Walpole probably hindered to some extent any clear understanding of the relationship which should exist between the cabinet and the legislature, or of the way in which the legislature might control government policy and administration through its control of the cabinet. If, however, there was apparently

The character of the result is also shown by another fact which the eighteenth century could not understand but the meaning of which is clear to us, the dropping of impeachment as a parliamentary weapon.[18] There is no case of impeachment in the old sense after the close of the struggle with the Stuarts. Contemporaries believed that the impeachment of Somers and his fellows in 1701 for their share in the Partition Treaty was an instance of its use for the old purpose, but plainly it was not, nor was any later impeachment or proposed impeachment.[19] It is hardly necessary but it serves the purpose of this discussion to state the reason why. Impeachment had been devised in the struggle between king and Parliament over the old issue, the seat of sovereignty in the state. Its purpose was, exactly like that of clause 61 of Magna Carta and every other expedient of the old type, to hold the king to a real responsibility without the danger of civil war and revolution which would result in those centuries, and perhaps at any time, from holding him to a formal responsibility. For this purpose it was the most effective of all the older expedients, though all of them were in a way successful when the king did not obstinately insist upon his own responsibility. But that issue was now settled. It never reappeared after the Revolution of 1688. The real issues were no longer those of a fundamental interpretation of the constitution between king and Parliament, but those of purpose and policy in the daily operation of government between the leaders of groups of opinion in the nation whose equal loyalty to the constitution was un-

little progress in the understanding of the facts, there was a steady drift in the facts themselves towards the principle that the cabinet must be in harmony with Parliament, or with the public opinion of the country. This is the meaning of the fall of Walpole in 1742, of the failure of Granville to form a ministry, and of the appointment of Pitt to the ministry in 1746, against the will of the king, as well as of the circumstances of his final accession to the cabinet about ten years later, to go no farther.

18 How puzzled contemporaries were by the changes which were going on is shown by the debates on responsibility which occurred in the generation following the Revolution. Parliament is vaguely conscious that its old weapons to enforce responsibility are out of date and useless, but is utterly at a loss to understand what to employ in their place. The reason why impeachment became obsolete is exactly the same as the reason why the royal veto did in the same period. In one case the reasons are regarded from the side of Parliament, in the other from the side of the king. Conflict of the old sort between executive and legislature, requiring the use of either weapon, was no longer possible. Conflicts of the new age were between phases of public opinion represented by parties in the legislature and both nominal and real executive were wholly dependent upon the legislative result.

19 Hallam says that these impeachments "have generally been reckoned a disgraceful instance of party spirit". See *Constitutional History* (1854), III. 144–145, 230. It may be added that the practice of withholding supplies as a means of coercion has also been practically abandoned for the same reason.

consciously accepted early in the period. In such a situation it was instinctively felt that it was an unworthy use of a party advantage to subject the leaders of the opposite side to a criminal prosecution and, though it was not yet seen what could be used in its place to enforce responsibility, impeachment was tacitly dropped.[20]

With the accession of George III. there came to the throne a king who, if he did not understand the cabinet system as we do, understood at least what its growth had cost the crown. It is significant of the great change which had come about in a century that George III.'s attempt to recover power was not an attack upon the settlement of 1660, it was no attempt to raise again the issue of the fundamental interpretation of the constitution, but it was an attack upon the results achieved since the death of William III. Neither king nor cabinet understood, however, during the first period of the reign the full meaning of the new institution. Had it been understood, had ministerial responsibility of the modern type existed then, it is no exaggeration to say that the American Revolution would not have occurred. But the ministry of Lord North was the real accomplishment of the king's purpose, and a real return to the situation under William III., when the king determined the

[20] The only coercion of the executive which any one would now think possible is the coercion of a cabinet which refused to yield to any of the ordinary means of discipline. Until the day of revolution comes, this would surely be coercion in a party conflict, that is, upon a question of public policy, not upon a fundamental constitutional issue. Such constitutional questions as have seemed to arise in the last hundred years have not been questions of the fundamental nature of the constitution as a whole but of the date, degree, and method of further advance in a development to which in general the constitution was already committed. I believe this to be essentially true of the questions raised on the passage of the Parliament Act, though the changes which it has made are of far-reaching importance.

The outside observer is tempted to believe that the tendencies of British political life during the past twenty years, with the great majorities returned in parliamentary elections, the growing strictness of party bonds, and the probable effect of some of the legislation adopted, have been away from the supposition which lies at the basis of ministerial responsibility, the supposition that members of the House of Commons who have supported the cabinet on one measure will vote against it on another. It would seem hardly possible that this tendency should go much farther without destroying ministerial responsibility of the old type and making the cabinet the absolute master of Parliament. While undoubtedly ministerial responsibility, as it existed thirty years ago, secures a more democratic government than the American system, with its complete separation of executive and legislature, that is, a government which yields more quickly to changes of public opinion, if the result suggested above should occur it would then be open to question whether the American system, with its more frequent congressional elections, would not prove more democratic. It is interesting to note that during the same period, the past thirty years, the direct influence of the President upon congressional legislation has increased very greatly though by methods that are indirect.

policy of the government and the business of the cabinet was to carry out his policy under a direct responsibility to him and only a secondary responsibility to Parliament. The failure of the attempt to bring the colonies back to their allegiance was also the failure of this last attempt of all to interfere with the natural development of the constitution.

It is my belief that the event which had the greatest influence in bringing the public mind of Britain to an understanding of the cabinet system and the modern principle of ministerial responsibility was the struggle of the younger Pitt to maintain himself against a hostile House of Commons. He succeeded but his success rendered another like it impossible. But this was not even then an immediate understanding. Full understanding comes slowly and gradually, by an unconscious process of reflection, not by revelation, through the next twenty-five years. Two incidents between 1784 and the close of the century show how incomplete the understanding still was. Three years after Pitt's triumph the Constitution of the United States was framed by a large assembly of the most experienced public men and students of politics in America, who considered with care the problem of setting up a government to operate in the best way. One great problem before them, set by the situation of the time, was to secure a really effective executive while leaving ultimate authority in the legislature as representing the people, exactly the problem which ministerial responsibility solves. In their Constitution, however, not merely did they entirely separate the executive and legislative departments,[21] but they gave little attention to the cabinet, and they seem to have had no idea whatever of ministerial responsibility. It seems altogether probable that they thought that in this respect they were following the English model, as beyond question they did when they adopted impeachment, and certainly, had there existed in England any such definite idea of ministerial responsibility as fifty years later, there would have been some dis-

[21] The practical result of the English cabinet system, though a result never theoretically desired or intended, is a union of the executive and the legislature. That this result was not foreseen when the first steps towards it were taken in the second half of the seventeenth century is evident from the ideas of Clarendon and Locke on the separation of the departments of government. On Clarendon see Carlyle, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 252–253, and on Locke the second *Treatise*, chs. XII. and XIII. Locke's ideas no doubt had a good deal of weight in America, but if the European cabinet system had been generally understood the advantages of that system as compared with Locke's ideas would, it is likely, have been carefully considered and the resulting decision in America would have been at least doubtful. See the thorough study of the Convention's attitude towards a cabinet in Learned, *The President's Cabinet*, ch. II., and *cf.* Farrand, *Framing of the Constitution*, pp. 166, 171.

cussion of it in the Convention. The other incident is even more indicative of English understanding. In 1791 Parliament under the leadership of Pitt's ministry framed a new government for Canada. The debate on the bill shows conclusively that the desire was to give to Canada the same kind of government which England had, and I think there can be no question but that this was honestly intended. And yet no responsible ministry was granted, or even proposed, and the foundation was laid for the later Canadian rebellion which opened a new era in British colonial government.[22]

It is from the opening years of the nineteenth century that we must date a full understanding of the cabinet system and of the way in which ministerial responsibility is enforced through it, though even then the understanding was rather that of practical action than of theoretical description.[23] It was not until about the middle of the century that descriptions of the system were written that seem satisfactory to us, and well past the middle before any treatise was published upon the new constitution as a whole.

The conclusion from this outline sketch seems inevitable. The break between the medieval form of ministerial responsibility and the modern was complete. In the period from 1688 to 1714 the new was beginning to take shape, but the old had in every real sense already disappeared. Contemporaries were wholly ignorant of what the new was to be, but they felt that the old was gone. They discussed the evil case in which they were left, they sought to find some way of holding ministers responsible, they even tried to revive the old method, but their discussions and attempts led to nothing.[24] The new came into existence without regard to their efforts and

[22] See my paper, "The Influence of the American Revolution on England's Government of her Colonies", *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for 1896, I. 373–389; *Lord Durham's Report* (ed. Sir C. P. Lucas, 1912), vol. I., chs. III., IV., and V., vol. II., pp. 76–82, 277–285; F. Bradshaw, *Self-Government in Canada* (1903); A. B. Keith, *Responsible Government in the Dominions* (1912), pt. I., ch. I.

[23] See the account of the literature in Learned, pp. 37 ff. Even so acute a student of constitutional history as Hallam did not clearly understand the change which had been made by the cabinet system, and did not later modify the statements of his first edition of 1827. *Const. Hist.* (1854), III. 183–185; (first ed., London, 1827), II. 535–539. A considerable influence in the development of nineteenth-century opinion and understanding was the discussion in England between 1830 and 1840 of the Canadian demands and Lord Durham's *Report* of 1839.

[24] See Anson, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXIX. 63. Direct coercion of the king was even thought of: "Harley after reminding his hearers that they had their negative voice as the King had his, and that, if His Majesty refused them redress, they could refuse him money, moved that they should go up to the Throne not, as usual, with a Humble Address, but with a Representation". Macaulay, ch. XX., vol. IV. (1858), pp. 483–484.

by the force of events which they did not understand. But it grew neither out of the old issue between king and Parliament, nor out of the old forms of coercion. Its origin is to be found in the efforts to work in daily government the compromise made in 1660. The English cabinet is a piece of machinery devised for operating a government in which sovereignty, and therefore the real executive, is actually vested in a legislative assembly while in form it is vested in a personal monarch. Ministerial responsibility, operated by what we call party government, is the method of coercion applied in such a constitution to the actual, not to the theoretical, executive. It has for its object not merely to compel the executive to regard the fundamental law of the state, which is a principle now so thoroughly established that it is never likely to be questioned, but also to carry out in the details of government the policy which Parliament decides upon. In one sense, in the sense of every-day practical action, it may be said to have taken the place of the older principle of the right to coerce the king, but in truth it is that principle applied to the real executive and the older form still exists in the background of the constitution, and conceivably might be called into action in some revolutionary age.

If it is true that the limited monarchy is derived from the principle introduced into English history by Magna Carta, that the king may be compelled to observe the fundamental law of the state, then both the medieval and the modern forms of coercion, though independent of one another, belong equally in that line of development.[25] The struggle of the seventeenth century was the last struggle of the absolute monarchy to maintain itself against the limited monarchy. From the side of the limited monarchy it was a period when the foundation and final defense of that form of constitution, in the will of the people expressed through their representatives, came to be apprehended. But all alike, the triumph of limited monarchy, the discovery of its scientific justification, and the machinery invented to carry it into practice, belong historically in the direct line of evolution begun by Magna Carta, are later stages of the development which first dates from it.

George Burton Adams.

[25] If any one will read the Bill of Rights with the thought consciously in mind that the fundamental principle introduced into the English constitution by Magna Carta was that the king must keep the law and that if he will not he may be forced to do so, I believe it will be at once clear that, in spite of all the changes of form and method in the interval, there had been no change in this fundamental principle. It is, in the simple form in which I have stated it, the obvious foundation on which the Bill of Rights rests, and which it almost states in so many words.

ANGLO-FRENCH COMMERCIAL RIVALRY, 1700–1750: THE WESTERN PHASE, II.

BEFORE 1700 the problem of French competition with England in the commercial world of the West had not become sufficiently prominent to demand a solution, but in the eighteenth century important changes took place which materially altered the situation. The area of the French sugar-producing colonies was enlarged by the addition of new territory, notably a considerable portion of the island of Santo Domingo or Hispaniola, where the soils were "new, vastly extended, incomparably more fertile, and easier of cultivation than any other Sugar Country in the World".[1] The French government at home gave renewed encouragement to its sugar colonies, transported planters and aided them to subsist, paid the salaries of their governors, and took care to strengthen and secure their settlements against attack. By new edicts it permitted the colonists to carry their sugars directly to Spain, thus ensuring further shipment to Italy and even to Turkey.[2] In consequence, the French output of sugar and its by-products was doubled and trebled and the demand of the French colonies for lumber, live-stock, and provisions became correspondingly great. Until this time the northern British colonies had been accustomed to send their surplus products to the southern continental colonies or to the

[1] Robertson, *An Enquiry into the Methods that are said to be now proposed in England to retrieve the Sugar Trade* (1733), p. 7. In its representation of January 14, 1735, the Board of Trade said that the worn-out state of Barbadoes required more labor and laborers than the fresh lands of Hispaniola and other islands (p. 14, printed copy). The circumstances of the French occupation of the island are given as follows: "The French first Setled on a small Island called Tobago, near the N. W. End of the Island of St. Domingo, and finding vast tracts of Land Uncultivated, opposite to them, they made bold to Remove and to take possession of that part which was of no use or disregarded by the Spaniards, who at first despised the Encroachments of the French or thought it not worth their while to dispossess them; or whether by mere negligence or other mistakes of that Indolent Nation they omitted to Suppress them when they might easily have done it. They are now become very numerous, in Actual possession of ¾ parts of the Island and in a few Years will in all probability entirely dispossess the Spaniards." "Observations on St. Domingo commonly called Hispaniola", by James Knight, October 21, 1740. British Museum, Add. MSS. 32695, f. 309. The French even tried to seize Jamaica in 1694, but were unsuccessful. *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1693–1696, §§ 1236 i., 1410.

[2] Robertson, *A Supplement to the Detection of the State and Situation of the Present Sugar Planters of Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands* (1733), pp. 16–18, 62–63.

British West Indies, thus fulfilling their mercantilist function as purveyors of supplemental staples to the British tropical and semi-tropical colonies. But this carefully adjusted equilibrium could not be maintained, as colonial conditions refused to remain stationary and the Northern Colonies refused to confine their activities to "such Produce, Trade, and Manufactures as are most for the Benefit of Great Britain" or to be diverted from raising more "of Cattle and Provisions than are needful or convenient for themselves".[3] The growth of the northern British colonies and the increase in production of lumber, livestock, and provisions destroyed the balance, and the rise of new economic conditions and trade requirements rendered inevitable the overthrow of this part of the mercantilist scheme. The surplus products of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania had to find a wider market and as they were not wanted in England, it is hardly surprising that the quick-witted traders of the North should have discovered the profitable opportunities that the needs of the French sugar colonies furnished.

According to every contemporary account all the British sugar

[3] To the mercantilist, England seemed criminally negligent in having allowed the Northern Colonies "to employ themselves so long in such Trade and Labours as it is evident interfere with her own essential Interests". They would have preferred that England should compel the colonies to expend all surplus energy in producing hemp, flax, silk, iron, potash, copper, and naval stores, instead of devoting it to raising provisions, livestock, and lumber. Robertson, *A Supplement,* pp. 49–51; *An Enquiry,* pp. 9–10. It is, of course, well known that the Board of Trade made many efforts to persuade the Northern Colonies to produce the staples desired by the mercantilists. The most noteworthy effort of this kind was in 1734, when the House of Lords adopted a resolution of its committee recommending that the Board of Trade be instructed to report on the encouragements necessary "to engage the Inhabitants of the British Colonies on the Continent of America to apply their Industry to the Cultivation of Naval Stores of all Kinds and likewise of such other Products as may be proper for the Soil of the said Colonies, and do not interfere with the Trade or Produce of Great Britain" (*Lords Journal,* XXIV. 412). Acting on this order, the board wrote a circular letter to the colonies asking for the desired information, and on January 14, 1735, sent to the House of Lords a representation "Relating to the State of the British Islands in America. . . . As likewise to such Encouragements as may be necessary to engage the Inhabitants", etc. (printed, manuscript copy in C. O. 324: 12, pp. 79–120). In this representation the board suggested that Parliament pass measures to encourage in the plantations the production of naval stores, wine, hemp, flax, silk, iron, pot and pearl ashes, and certain drugs (p. 17), and this Parliament did in the case of silk, indigo, and pot and pearl ashes. Varying quantities of tar, pitch, turpentine, potash, flax-seed, and iron were exported to England and Ireland. Whale oil, also, was in demand at home and a small amount of indigo was sent over. The latter came mostly from the French West Indies, notably Hispaniola, but it is interesting to observe that Connecticut, acting on the recommendation of Parliament, endeavored to promote its cultivation in the colony. Conn. Arch., Foreign Correspondence, II., doc. 163a.

islands, except Jamaica, were declining, and their demand, which even in times of prosperity would not have been sufficient to take off the entire output of the Northern Colonies, was unable to keep pace with the supply. The New Englanders could sell to the French more cheaply than could the merchants of France and had a monopoly of the trade as long as the French island market was not glutted.[4] On the other hand they could buy more cheaply in the French and Dutch West India market, where the foreign planters, with only a one per cent. export duty to meet, were better off than the English with their eighteen pence per hundred plantation duty of 1672 and their four and a half per cent. export duty of 1663, and where French sugars were rated from twenty-five to thirty per cent. cheaper than were those of Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands.[5] Molasses, too, they could obtain for about what they were willing to pay, as it was a commodity practically worthless to the French. The value of this trade, in which the French could undersell the British planters, was so great that the governors of the French islands were authorized to issue at their discretion permits for trade to masters of colonial and British vessels, purchasable at prices dependent on the value of the cargo.[6]

Despite the agreement entered into in 1686 between England and France that the subjects of the one were not to frequent the ports

[4] Provisions brought in French ships, belonging to Nantes, Bordeaux, and other French cities, generally came from Ireland. Robertson repudiates the assertion that lumber, horses, or provisions could be furnished "at a tolerable price" from any of the French settlements in Canada or the Mississippi region. "Let them try to procure their Lumber from those places", he says, "if they can". *A Supplement*, p. 25. One of the objections raised by the Northern Colonies to the first Molasses Bill, that of 1731, was that if the French were prevented from trading with these colonies as the bill proposed, they would build up Canada and Cape Breton as provision and lumber supplying regions, and in so doing strengthen French control in Canada to the serious danger of the British colonies to the southward.

[5] Lieut.-Gov. Nanfan of New York bought sugars at Martinique twenty-five per cent. cheaper than they were rated at Barbadoes. Robertson and others reported the difference at thirty per cent. *A Supplement*, p. 16.

[6] This fact was brought out in the inquiry before the House of Commons (*Commons Journal*, XXI. 686). Ample additional testimony exists. "There has been sixteen to twenty New England Vessels at Martinico at a time, each of which had a writing purporting a permission to sell." "This trade is permitted by the French government, as well because the French planters have no other way to dispose of their Rum and Molasses as because the French can't be supplied with Horses and Lumber from any other places but the English Northern Colonies." *Observations on the Case of the Northern Colonies* (1731), pp. 27–28, 29. For a detailed statement of the cost of raising sugar in Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands, see Robertson, *A Detection of the State and Situation of the Present Sugar Planters of Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands* (1732), pp. 40–49.

of, or trade with, the other, or in any manner to interfere with the commerce belonging to the subjects of the other,[7] this trade attained large proportions. We hear of "unlawful trade with the French" as early as 1700,[8] and so zealous were certain of the island governors to observe and execute the instructions given them in this particular that they even caused British ships trading with the French islands to be seized and condemned.[9] At the same time, whenever the French islands found themselves sufficiently stocked with staples from the north or the wheat harvest in France was sufficiently bountiful, they were wont to seize vessels from Ireland and the Northern Colonies in order to check what they called, when it was advantageous to do so, a contraband trade.[10] This trade customarily took two forms. The northern colonists might sell their produce to the British West Indies for cash and passing on, purchase their return cargo from the French islands, a traffic estimated at one-third to one-half of the whole; or they might carry their horses, building materials, and provisions, and other plantation necessities directly to the French or other foreign islands and there exchange them either for cash or more frequently for sugar, molasses, and rum.[11] In either case, the loss fell on the British West

[7] "Treaty of Peace, Good Correspondence, and Neutrality in America", Whitehall, November 6/16, 1686, §§ 5, 6. Printed in full, *Commons Journal*, XXI. 713–715.

[8] *Cal. St. P., Col.*, 1700, § 789.

[9] "Their Lordships observing that the Governors have so farr mistaken the Sense of the said Articles and their Instructions grounded thereon as to proceed to the Condemnation of the Ships and Cargoes belonging to His Majestys Subjects under pretence of their having Contravened the said Articles by Trading to the French Plantations, which was not the Sense of those Articles, which could only entitle His Majestys Governors to Condemn French Ships Trading to our Plantations, there being no Law to Justify the Condemnation of Ships belonging to His Majestys Subjects for such Trade." *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, vol. III., § 149; see also *ibid.*, § 405.

[10] "The traders of our Northern Colonies wou'd not come near any English Island in the West Indies, if it were not that the French, when glutted with Lumber, Horses, and Provisions, prohibit all farther commerce with them." Robertson, *A Supplement*, pp. 21, 41.

[11] Capt. Penmure of the Rhode Island sloop *Charming Polly*, according to an extant sailing agreement of 1752, was to go first to St. Vincent, then to Dominica, and then to St. Eustatius, selling his cargo as he could, for cash if possible, but for goods if such only could be obtained in exchange. In the latter case all goods were to be disposed of for cash at St. Eustatius, and with only money in hand, he was to go to Hispaniola and there buy indigo, muscovado, and molasses for the home voyage. At this time (1752) neither St. Vincent nor Dominica were British islands, being supposedly neutral according to the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, St. Eustatius was Dutch, and Hispaniola was part Spanish and part French. The agreement authorized the captain to secure a "French pass". *Commerce of Rhode Island* (Mass. Hist. Soc. *Coll.*, seventh series), IX. 60–61.

Indian planters, denuding them of their coin,[12] of which they had none too much, or cutting into their market for sugar and depriving them of their needed supply of provisions and lumber. The situation was a very undesirable one from the point of view of the British sugar planter, and equally unsatisfactory from the point of view of the British customs, for all "dead" commodities exported from the French islands to the northern British colonies meant to the British exchequer a loss by just so much of the four and a half per cent. and the plantation duties.[13]

Hispaniola rivalled St. Eustatius as an entrepôt for foreign commodities. "En general son Commerce Consiste en sucres blancs et brûts, Indigos Caffeés, Cuirs, et quelques autres effets de peu de Consequence; comme Tabac Caret Gingembre, etc. Mais une grande Branche de son commerce, consiste encore en Marchandises seches de France, comme toiles, Chapeaux D'orures, Etoffes de Soye, etc. que les Espagnols y Viennent achepter, et qu'ils paient en or et en argent." From a long and valuable account of Santo Domingo, entitled "Lettre a [M. Mildmay] sur le commerce present de St. Domingue et l'Etat present de Cette Colonie" (Paris, May, 1751), Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 32828, ff. 72–77 b. Mildmay was one of the English commissioners sent to Paris in 1750 to settle the Acadian question. His colleague was Gov. Shirley of Massachusetts. The writer of the letter is not certainly known, but he had been for a long time a resident of the southern part of the island, f. 73.

[12] "The great Prices of our Commodites, with Respect of the other Colonies about us, tempt the Irish, Northern, and other Traders, to carry off our Gold and light Silver to those Colonies, where they can buy the same Commodities, at a cheaper Rate, with our Money. . . . This Condition of our Affairs has been the Cause of carrying away our Silver, while we had any, it being the most beneficial Part of our Currency for most Purposes." *Caribbeana*, I. 135 (Barbadoes). For Barbadoes the annual drain of specie was estimated at £85,000 stg.; *Present State of the British Sugar Colonies Considered*, p. 23. For Jamaica at £64,977 stg. "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Scarcity of Money", pp. 21–22 (Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 30163), a work that contains an exceptionally good statement of the influence of the Northern trade upon the financial situation in the island. Robertson discusses the question for the Leeward Islands but does not give figures.

[13] "This trade tends to the Encrease and Improvement of the Foreign Sugar Colonies and the decrease of our own and is at present very prejudicial to His Majesty's Revenue; for without this Trade, the Sugar, Rum, and Molasses consumed in the Northern Colonies would be Exported from the English Sugar Colonies and pay His Majesty not only a duty of 4½ per cent. but also the Enumerated Duty as we call it, which is a duty of 18 pence per hundred paid the King for all Sugars exported to our Colonies. The Quantity of Sugars imported to our Colonies from the French and Dutch is so great that they send a great deal of it to England as the Produce of our Colonies. By which means His Majesty is not only defrauded of the Double Duty, but also of the Enumerated Duty supposed to have been paid upon this first Exportation from the Colony where they were made." Letter from W. Gordon to the Board of Trade, August 17, 1720, C. O. 5:867, W. 110.

This trade in all its manifold aspects is discussed at length by the pamphleteers of the period and a list of such writings will be given in a later note. One of the fairest and least contentious of the writers is Robertson, a planter of Nevis, who had resided on that island since 1706, and, in the years from

The growth of this trade from 1713[14] to 1730 became so rapid as to alarm the British merchants and planters, particularly in Barbadoes, the centre of resistance to the French encroachment. The attention of the home authorities was called to the calamitous condition of the planters, and in 1724 the Privy Council ordered the Board of Trade to prepare a full state of the sugar and tobacco trades.[15] Four years later it instructed the same body to consider "what Laws it may be reasonable to pass in the Severall Plantations for restraining his Majesty's Subjects from Importing into the British Plantations such products of the French Plantations as may interfere with the British Trade".[16] In the meantime the Barbadians had begun a determined campaign of their own. They formed an organization, raised funds which they transmitted to London,[17] and despatched representatives to act there in conjunction with the agents of the colony. They invited the planters of the Leeward Islands to join in the movement, offering to meet all expenses. In 1730 and 1731 the matter was brought to the immediate attention of the Privy Council in a series of petitions from the "Planters, Traders, and other Inhabitants" of Barbadoes and the "several Merchant Planters and others interested in and trading to His

1727 to 1733, wrote a series of letters to the Bishop of London, a member of Parliament, and a gentleman of London, that were printed. The titles are *A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London* (1730), with *A Short Essay concerning the Conversion of the Negro-Slaves in our Sugar Colonies* (written in June, 1727), *A Detection* (already cited), *A Supplement to the Detection* (already cited), *An Enquiry* (already cited), and *A Short Account of the Hurricane* (1733), which contains (pp. 26–28) a statement of the conditions under which the pamphlets were written. These pamphlets present an admirable defense of the case of the sugar planters, with special reference to the Leeward Islands.

In *A Short View of the Smuggling Trade carried on by the British Northern Colonies in Violation of the Acts of Navigation and several other Acts of Parliament* may be found a characteristic survey of the general situation, with sections on "Some of the Ill Consequences arising from this Trade to Great Britain" (p. 2), "Some of the Ill Consequences arising from this Trade to the Sugar Colonies" (pp. 2–3), and "Benefits which Great Britain may derive to herself and her Sugar Colonies by putting an Effectual Stop to this Trade" (pp. 3–4). The only copy of this paper that I have seen is in the British Museum. It is undated.

[14] Robertson traces the French encouragement of the trade to the years immediately following the treaty of Utrecht. *A Supplement*, pp. 18–19.

[15] The Board of Trade, in reply to this order, sent in an elaborate report dated July 24, 1724, *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, vol. III., § 62. A copy of the complete report may be found in C. O. 5 : 389, 28, pp. 175–219.

[16] *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, III. 193.

[17] "I believe the Barbads people would give or expend at le[a]st £2000 sterlg to obtain their end." Partridge to Gov. Jencks of Rhode Island, August 23, 1731, Kimball, *Correspondence of the Colonial Governors of Rhode Island*, I. 20.

Majesty's Sugar Colonies in America". At the same time agents and representatives of the northern British colonies appeared to defend their side of the case. The borough authorities of Liverpool upheld the cause of the Sugar Colonies, while the merchants of Dublin naturally took the part of the Northern Colonies. Exasperated by frequent postponements of the hearing before the Privy Council, and convinced that the Sugar Colonies were "engaged in a mortal Combat with those of Foreign Nations" and that no "quacking and palliative Medicines" would suffice, the Barbadians and their allies finally decided to seek directly the aid of the British Parliament.[18] On March 30, 1731, they withdrew their petition to the king, announcing that they had made application to Parliament for relief "in the Matters complained of in their said Petitions".[19] In so doing they expressed not only their discontent with the procedure of the Privy Council, but also their agreement with a rapidly growing conviction in England and the colonies that an act of Parliament was a more "certain and effectual" means of gaining relief in matters colonial and commercial than was an order in Council,[20] which could do nothing more than authorize the passing of remedial legislation by the colonies themselves.

The appeal to Parliament was at first unsuccessful. The government, with manifest reluctance and a lively realization of the issues involved, brought the matter before the House of Commons in the form of a bill for securing and encouraging the trade of the British West Indies. This bill was planned as a blow at the French sugar trade, and was designed to check and turn back if possible the French invasion of the British colonial market. It declared that no sugar, rum, or molasses of the plantations of foreign nations should be imported into Great Britain or Ireland or any of the king's dominions in America under penalty of forfeiture; and that no horses or lumber should be carried to the foreign sugar colonies. As a prohibitive measure, this bill was a true mercantilist device,

[18] *Caribbeana*, I. 83, 85, 195. "Nothing can help our desperate Case, but a thorough Regulation of the whole Habit. The British Parliament must be our Physician." *Ibid.*, pp. 135–136. Robertson takes the same position when he approves of the statement, "The Disease of the British Sugar Colonies will gangrene by a Palliative Cure." *A Supplement*, p. 75.

[19] *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, vol. III., § 222.

[20] For a situation that was not dissimilar, see my article on "The Connecticut Intestacy Law" in *Select Essays in Anglo-American Legal History*, I. 456–458, especially p. 458, note 2. Even the committee of the whole Council, reporting in 1725 on the salary question in Massachusetts, acknowledged the failure of the royal authority, as expressed in the governors' instructions, and advised the king "to order this whole Matter to be laid before the Parliament of Great Britain". *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, III. 111.

for though the merchants and planters were ready to present a dozen minor remedies for the relief of the sugar trade, they were all agreed that complete prohibition was the only certain method of attaining the desired end. On the plea of their own necessity and the welfare of the mother-country they sought to control by means of parliamentary legislation a course of trade that was the natural and inevitable outcome of the agricultural and commercial life of the northern British colonies.

The struggle that followed was exciting. The supporters of the bill declared that the British sugar islands were in a languishing condition, their export of sugar diminished, their duties high, their plantations understocked, their planters poor, their soil worn out, and their fortifications destroyed.[21] They acknowledged that the French islands contained fresher sugar land than the British, were more fruitful, better inhabited, paid less duties, and had greater encouragement from the home country.[22] But, they maintained, the British islands were a source of great profit to England and must be protected, else they would steadily deteriorate and might eventually pass into the hands of the French themselves. For, as Robertson expressed it, "this Contest is not as some weak People imagine and some selfish People would have us all to think, a Contest between the British Southern and Northern Colonies, but between Great Britain and France, which of the two shall be Mistress of the Foreign Sugar Trade." "We are contending", he continued, "with the united Forces of our Nation's Rivals in the Sugar Trade and the Practices of our too selfish Sister Colonies on the Continent."[23]

On the other hand, the opponents of the measure asserted that the passage of the bill would ruin the Bread Colonies by diminishing the supply and raising the price of tropical staples desired by the

[21] A resident of Jamaica, writing about 1750 (the work already noted, entitled "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Scarcity of Money"), took a much more hopeful view of the future of that island than others took of the future of Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands. He wished to clear up the "melancholy prospect" of Jamaica that prevailed in England. Nevertheless, on the general situation and the trade of the Northern Colonies he is in accord with the others. The statement in the text is based on opinions common to all the writers of the period and needs no special proof in the way of citations. Among the House of Lords manuscripts are a number of petitions, for and against the bill, some of which were sent up from the Plantation Office. Andrews and Davenport, *Guide*, pp. 204–209, nos. 110, 113, 117, 119, 138.

[22] The Jamaican writer mentions among "the many other good Regulations and Encouragements of the French Committee of commerce" the bounty of 9*s.* 2*d.* per head allowed by the French king on negroes imported, p. 15.

[23] *A Supplement*, pp. 53–54, 55; *An Enquiry*, p. 20. *Cf.* Winnington's speech in the House of Commons, *Parliamentary History*, VIII. 993.

New Englanders, and by cutting off the market for the northern staples would glut the demand and lower the price in the West Indies. Should the bill pass, they insisted, the Northern Colonies would certainly suffer in their wealth and prosperity, would become the slaves and bondsmen of the Sugar Colonies, and be reduced to the status of purveyors without independent economic and commercial life.[24] Turning on the supporters of the bill, they declared that the present situation was due not so much to the decline of the islands as to the sumptuous and extravagant habits of the planters, and to the fact that owners of plantations resident in England, a number far too large for the good of the colonies, wished to continue the large profits that enabled them to play the part they desired in English social and political life.[25] In other words, they

[24] Herein lay the crucial point of the dispute. The mercantilists who upheld the cause of the Sugar Islands saw in an independent economic life for the Northern Colonies a menace to the prosperity of the mother-country. In this particular, at least, the views of the disputants were irreconcilable. The danger to England of foreign success in the race for territory or the race for markets is a factor to be reckoned with in our colonial history. Just as the relations with Spain to 1660 and with Holland to 1675 affected colonial affairs of the seventeenth century, so the rivalry with France to 1763 influenced the colonial policy of the Board of Trade and determined many of the measures introduced into Parliament that concerned the colonies in the first half of the eighteenth century even, including the bills designed to bring the proprietary and corporate colonies immediately under the authority of the crown. The traditional view of colonial history cannot but err in its estimate of British purpose when it ignores the larger issues upon which British policy rested. Fears of French commercial supremacy governed very materially the attitude of British statesmen, officials, legislators, and merchants toward matters colonial during the years from 1700 to 1750, and a knowledge of this fact clears up many things hitherto overlooked or inadequately explained.

[25] That many of the British West Indian planters were extravagant in their dress and mode of living seems amply attested, but how far the luxurious life of individual planters was responsible for the existing situation is not so clear. The Jamaican ("An Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Scarcity of Money") has much to say on this point. He speaks of "our extravegances, which consist mostly of costly liquors of foreign growth and French fineries", p. 51, and he estimates that £50,000 was annually expended in luxury, which was "a great drain on the wealth of the island", pp. 92–93.

More important was the question of absentee-planters. This question was deemed so vital to the welfare of the colonies that from 1730 to 1764 acts were passed, notably in Jamaica, but also in Antigua and St. Christopher, imposing a double tax on absentees. The Board of Trade recommended that these acts be disallowed as unjust and improper. *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, vol. III., § 557, p. 739, vol. IV., § 48, vol. VI., §§ 457, 461, 465, 471, 473, 588. In the Jamaican's paper appears the following item, "To so much allowed to be drained off the country by absentees, for Lodgements and for the Education of the Youth in Engd. 200,000", pp. 95–96. A visitor to Antigua in 1774 speaks of the numbers of absentees "that leave this little paradise and throw away vast sums of money in London, where they are either entirely overlooked, or ridiculed for an extravagance which after all does not raise them to a level with hundreds

said, the British West Indian sugar planters asked to be favored at the expense of the remainder of the colonial world;[26] and if they were so favored then England would lose the Bread Colonies as a vent for her manufactures, because the latter would have no money wherewith to buy English goods.

To the last group of arguments the mercantilists replied with equal spirit. They declared that the charges of extravagance and luxury, made by Joshua Gee, the agents of the Northern Colonies, and the pamphleteers, were based on ignorance of the actual balance sheets of the sugar plantations, and that in fact the bulk of the sugar planters were so far from being opulent that not a few of them were in debt in England and the greater part of the plantations considerably understocked in "hands" as well as other neces-

around them. Antigua has more proprietors, however, than any of the other islands; St. Christophers, they tell me, is almost abandoned to overseers and managers, owing to the amazing fortunes that belong to individuals, who almost all reside in England." Brit. Mus., Egerton 2423, pp. 111–112. This statement regarding St. Christopher is confirmed by a letter of April 5, 1780, in which it is said that "in Antigua, being poorer than St. Kitts, most of the landed proprietors live on the island because they cannot afford to live in England, whereas at St. Kitts, there are mostly managers". Oliver, *History of Antigua,* I. cxxiv. The practice was a very old one and dates back to the beginning of West Indian history. Newton, *Colonising Activities of the English Puritans,* p. 159. Robertson speaks of "those who have estates in the Leeward Islands and live in England themselves (of which there are several in and about London)", and he notes a member of the Board of Trade who "in right of his Lady, became owner of a plantation in the island of Nevis", *A Detection,* p. 50. Abraham Redwood, of Newport, Rhode Island, who founded the Redwood Library there and gave 100 Spanish milled dollars to the poor of the town, had a plantation in Antigua. *Commerce of Rhode Island* (Mass. Hist. Soc. *Coll.,* seventh series), IX. 1–64; Oliver, *History of Antigua,* III. 43–46.

[26] That self-interest underlay the arguments of the Barbadians and Leeward Islanders is manifest and not surprising. A similar self-interest underlay the attitude of the Northern Colonies toward the Navigation Acts as a whole. The same conflict of interests may be seen in the objections raised by the British West India merchants to the grant of Tobago in 1728 to the Duke of Montagu, on the ground that new plantations tended to reduce the price of sugar (*Acts of the Privy Council, Col.,* VI. 197), a curious objection in view of the frequent arguments at this time in favor of extending the area of British sugar planting in the West Indies (Robertson, *A Supplement,* pp. 60–61, 69–70). The same conflict may be seen in the attempt of Barbadian planters to stop the New England trade to Surinam in 1714, because they deemed it detrimental to the British sugar plantations and to the trade and navigation of the kingdom (*Acts of the Privy Council, Col.,* vol. II., § 1200). Thomas Banister of Boston showed clearly the value of the Surinam trade to New England; and so evident was the injustice of stopping it, that Parliament refused to interfere (*New York Col. Docs.,* V. 597; Letter of W. Gordon, C. O. 5: 867, W 110; *A Short Essay on the Principal Branches of the Trade of New England, with the Difficulties they labour under and some Methods of Improvement,* by T[homas] B[anister] (London, 1715), pp. 12–13. The original draft of this essay, which is in the form of a letter to the Board of Trade, is in C. O. 5: 866, V 91.

saries for carrying on the sugar manufacture.[27] They insisted that the Northern Colonies were in fact what the tropical colonies were falsely said to be, very rich, and that the conduct of the latter in "dissembling what they are has perhaps turned as much to their private advantage, as our folly in boasting of what we never were, has injured both us and our Mother Nation". As to the Northern Colonies obtaining their supply of hard money by this trade, the planters denied the assertion with emphasis, claiming that the money obtained from the British islands was laid out in the purchase of commodities at the French islands, and that not one penny of it was carried back to New England, New York, or Philadelphia, or remitted to England. And as to favoring one part of the colonial world more than another, the bill was designed to benefit the commerce of Great Britain and to advance the welfare of the colonies that were of most importance to her, and no one could deny that in this respect the sugar trade and the Sugar Colonies were deserving of greater attention than the provision trade and the Bread Colonies.[28]

[27] The only British colony in the West Indies that was able to obtain a sufficient stock of good slaves was Barbadoes. The Leeward Islands and Jamaica were always understocked, and even in Barbadoes it was claimed that the best negroes went to the French and Spanish plantations, partly because the French controlled the richest areas of supply and partly because the French and Spanish were able to offer better prices on account of the steadily increasing demand. Furthermore it was reported that the soil in Hispaniola was so rich that the planters could do more with one slave than could be done with four at Jamaica (*Commons Journal*, XXI. 687). On the other hand, Knight said that the negroes in Hispaniola had "very little affection to their Masters, by reason of their severity and the hard labour they put them to" (Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 32695, f. 310). The letter to Mildmay, already cited, devotes considerable space to the negro trade of Hispaniola (*ibid.*, 32828, ff. 74b–76), and Robertson in his *Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London* treats of the understocking of the British sugar plantations.

[28] The literature of this discussion, both in print and in manuscript, is very extensive, but the arguments are often far from convincing. "In each case", to quote a comment made on trade quarrels in England at an earlier date, "both parties had an interest in representing their own trade as languishing through the prosperity of their opponents, while the opponents retorted that they themselves were not half so prosperous as was made out." *Social England*, IV. 122. The following list is representative but not exhaustive. *The Case of the Provinces of the Massachusetts Bay and New Hampshire and the Colonies of Rhode Island with Providence Plantations, and Connecticut in New England, and the Province of New Jersey, with respect to the Bill now depending in the Honourable House of Commons, intituled a Bill for the better securing and encouraging the Trade of His Majesty's Sugar Colonies in America* (1731); *The Case of the British Northern Colonies* (1731); *Observations on the Case of the British Northern Colonies* (1731); "A Letter on the Bill now depending in Parliament", in *The Free Briton*, April 15, 1731; a letter to *The Daily Post Boy*, March 6, 1731; *The Importance of the British Sugar Plantations in America*

The bill of 1731, though passed by the House of Commons and debated in the House of Lords, was finally dropped altogether.[29] This event is a landmark in the history of the relations not only between England and France, but also between England and her continental colonies in America. It marked the first important failure of that phase of the mercantilist policy which rated the colonies furnishing tropical products more highly than those taking off manufactured articles,[30] and it began the tilting of the balance in favor of the Bread Colonies, a movement slow in its consummation, and not completed till 1763 when Guadeloupe was returned to France and Canada retained. It marked the first failure of a de-

to this Kingdom, with the State of their Trade and Methods for Improving it (1731); *A Short Answer* (to the same), *in a Letter to a Noble Peer* (1731); *The Present State of the British Sugar Islands Considered, in a Letter from a Gentleman of Barbadoes to his Friend in London* (1731); *The British Empire in America Considered,* in a second letter from the same (1732); *The Controversy between the Northern Colonies and the Sugar Islands respectively Considered* (1732?); *Arguments against the Bill for the better securing and encouraging the Trade of His Majesty's Sugar Colonies in America* (unsigned and undated, but either 1731 or 1732); and the various writings of Robertson, already cited. All of these pamphlets were written to uphold or oppose the bills of 1731 and 1733, but later letters and papers, issued during the continuance of the controversy, 1733–1763, repeat many of the same arguments. See also the representations of the Board of Trade to Parliament, February 1, 1733 (printed, manuscript copy in C. O. 5: 5, ff. 1–24), January 23, 1734 (printed, manuscript copy in C. O. 324: 12, pp. 7–72), and January 14, 1735 (printed, manuscript copies in C. O. 5: 5, ff. 102–123, and 324: 12, pp. 79–120). For the last two, see Andrews and Davenport, *Guide,* p. 208. An excellent résumé of the arguments is given in Salmon, *Modern History,* III. 624–632 (1739).

[29] The petition from the Sugar Colonies was discussed in Parliament and evidence taken, February 23, 1731 (*Commons Journal,* XXI. 641, 685–689; *Parliamentary History,* VIII. 856–857). The bill was debated January 28, 1732 (*Commons Journal,* XXI. 782; *Parl. Hist.,* VIII. 918–921); and February 23 (*Commons Journal,* XXI. 811; *Parl. Hist.,* VIII. 992–1002), and went to committee in March. It was passed March 15, by a vote of 110 to 37 (*Commons Journal,* XXI. 849), and carried to the Lords the next day (*Lords Journal,* XXIV. 52). There it went to the select committee on the 17th, and on the 21st the agents of the colonies were given a hearing (pp. 54, 58–59). It reached the committee stage on the same day, and representations, returns, and statistics were called for (pp. 59, 60, 64, 67–68). On March 31 it passed the second reading (p. 77). More information was required, and on April 25 petitions were received (Andrews and Davenport, *Guide,* pp. 204–205), and agents and others heard (*Lords Journal,* XXIV. 97–98). Further consideration was postponed first till May 3 and then for a month, but when the time came Parliament had been prorogued.

[30] The advantages of the Northern Colonies as a source of supply, a vent for manufactures, and a territory capable of indefinite development were all rated of no profit to Great Britain, and far less deserving of consideration than the one asset of the sugar trade. The mercantilist deemed a tract of land greater than could be "either cultivated or defended" a menace, not an advantage.

liberate act of commercial warfare, which would certainly have been passed against France and other foreign nations in the West Indies, had not mercantilism already lost something of its power and had not the Bread Colonies already attained such strength that their welfare could not be ignored. The bill of 1731 was upheld not only by the governor, agents, and merchants of Barbadoes, and by the sugar planters resident in London and the outports, but also by the Board of Trade, the auditor general of the plantation revenues,[31] and a large majority of the members of the House of Commons. Despite the failure of the bill to pass the House of Lords, the debates and hearings in committee show that the mercantilist doctrines were still uppermost in England.

In 1733 the planters returned to the attack and this time they were successful. The new measure, endorsed by a special representation sent from the Board of Trade to the House of Commons, was accepted by the House of Lords, because it omitted the objectionable features of the first bill, and finally became a law.[32] Thus, after a discussion lasting not less than ten years, the famous Molasses Act of 1733 came into existence. But it was, from the standpoint of the true mercantilist, an emasculated measure, in that it conceded the very principle which the bill of 1731 had denied, the right of traffic between the British Bread Colonies and the foreign Sugar Colonies. Sugar, rum, and molasses, under heavy duties, might be imported into the northern continental colonies, and horses and lumber might be exported without restraint into the French, Dutch, and Danish West Indies. It is true that the duties imposed were judged to be tantamount to a prohibition, so that even in its modified form the measure was a blow aimed at the commercial encroachments of the French, but the act did allow the Northern Col-

[31] The auditor, Horatio Walpole, seconded the motion to commit the bill, February 23, 1732 (*Parl. Hist.*, VIII. 995). He also introduced the bill of 1733 (*Commons Journal*, XXII. 71), made a speech, and offered an amendment (*Parl. Hist.*, VIII. 1197).

[32] Parliament met in new session, January 16, 1733. The question was debated February 21 (*Commons Journal*, XXII. 54; *Parl. Hist.*, VIII. 1195–1199), and reported favorably by committee, February 22 (*Commons Journal*, XXII. 55–56). The bill was brought in March 5, was debated (*Commons Journal*, XXII. 79; *Parl. Hist.*, VIII. 1261), and passed the second reading (*Commons Journal*, XXII. 83). On March 21 it passed the House of Commons (p. 99) and was sent to the Lords April 3 (*Lords Journal*, XXIV. 223). There it was debated April 12 (p. 231) and April 23 (p. 242), and passed the second reading April 23 (p. 243). It then went to the committee of the whole House (p. 244), from which it was reported without amendment, May 1 (p. 252). It was passed, May 4, referred back to the House of Commons, May 7, and received the royal consent, May 17. The law was passed for five years only, but was renewed by 11 George II., c. 18; 19 George II., c. 23; 26 George II., c. 32; 29 George II., c. 26; 31 George II., c. 36; and 1 George III., c. 9, till 1763.

onies to export all but the enumerated commodities to the foreign West Indies, thus favoring these colonies as far as possible. At best it was but a half-way measure, unsatisfactory to the mercantilists, because it was not prohibitory, and burdensome to the Northern Colonies, because it restrained, or tried to restrain, their freedom of commercial intercourse. Its promoters might have realized that liberty of export without a direct importation in return would not benefit the Northern Colonies, and that if right of export were allowed by law, a direct import would be secured by evasion.[33] In almost every particular the Molasses Act proved a failure. It probably did nothing to injure the prosperity of the French colonies, if we are to believe John Bennett's account of the situation in 1736.[34] It profited little to the advantage of Great Britain, because it did not materially increase the customs revenue and fell short of meeting the expense of collecting the duties imposed.[35] It failed to answer the needs and expectations of the British West Indian planters because it did not go far enough. And, finally, it checked but slightly the export of French sugars to the northern British colonies because it was consistently evaded from the first.[36]

The sequel demonstrates the truth of these conclusions. The

[33] Partridge, the agent of Rhode Island, wrote to Deputy Governor Wanton, "In the present Bill they have left out the Restriction of sending Horses and Lumber to the Foreign Plantations but we think in a Manner this is as bad as the old Bill for to what Purpose will it be to have Liberty to send away our Commodities if we cannot have Returns for them?" Kimball, *Correspondence*, I. 23–24.

[34] See John Bennett's pamphlet, below note 37.

[35] The Jamaican writing in 1750 (Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 30163) estimated the returns from the eighteen pence plantation duty at only £675 a year from Jamaica, a relatively insignificant sum. In 1754 the statement was made that the duty on all sugars from the British West Indies to the Northern Colonies came to no more than £1500 a year, showing an export of only 1400 hhds. of British sugar. So small an amount made it clear that a great deal of French and Dutch sugar was used by the Northern Colonies. Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 34729, f. 355. In 1765 the Treasury informed the Privy Council that the revenue arising from the "Duties of Customs imposed on your Majestys Subjects in America and the West Indies . . . is very small and inconsiderable, having in no degree increased with the Commerce of those Countries, and is not yet sufficient to defray a fourth Part of the Expence necessary for collecting it." *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, IV. 569.

[36] "I am sorry to observe that the Duties imposed thereby on Foreign Rum and Molasses are evaded, and the Design of that well intended Law totally eluded; so that instead of being beneficial, it is like to prove in some Respects fatal to these Colonies and their Trade. 'Tis notorious that most of the Northern Traders who come hither, and to the Leeward Islands, do now sell their Cargoes, or such Part thereof, as is most in Demand, for ready Money. This they carry off, and rendezvouze sometimes 40 Sail at a Time at St. Eustatia, a Dutch Settlement in the Center of the Leeward and Virgin-Islands, where great Quantities of the Commodities I am speaking of, are constantly lodged for Sale, which they purchase to load their Vessels, without either Fear or Restraint,

effects of the act were slight. Conditions after 1733 were but little changed from what they had been before. The West Indian planters were not satisfied with the terms and demanded further concessions. They sent in petitions to the Board of Trade, wrote pamphlets,[37] encouraged lobbying by the colonial agents, and made the Jamaica Coffee House, Cornhill, the centre of an active propaganda. They complained forcibly of the incumbrances and charges still left upon the West Indian trade, comparing their own decline to the prosperity of the French islands and ascribing it to many causes. Chief among these were the enumeration of sugar[38] and

whereby we do not only lose the Sale of those Species, but are, at the same Time, drained of our Cash." Letter dated from Barbadoes, March 2, 1735, *Caribbeana*, II. 129.

"We are disappointed of the good Effect expected from the Act for better securing, and encouraging the Trade of His Majestys Sugar Colonies in America, by the Northern Traders, who still carry it on." By the same writer, May 22, 1736. *Ibid.*, pp. 161.

The Jamaican writing in 1750 speaks of the "Norward Traders smuggling with the French" as "proved by matters of Fact strongly attested", Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 30163, p. 23; and see below, note 50, for the action of the traders in 1752.

[37] The most important pamphlets of this period are by John Ashley, a planter of Barbadoes, entitled *The Sugar Trade with the Incumbrances laid open* (1734) and *Some Observations on a direct Exportation of Sugar from the British Islands, with Answers to Mr. Torriano's Objections* (1735). The "Mr. Torriano" referred to was Nathaniel Torriano, a merchant of London, who had sent a long letter, dated August 8, 1724, in which he presented arguments against relieving the Sugar Colonies of the obligation to send their sugars to England. Later, Ashley published another pamphlet entitled *Memoirs and Considerations on the Trade and Revenue of the British Colonies in America* (1740). One should consult also John Bennett, *Four Letters concerning the flourishing Condition, large Export, and prodigious Increase of the French Sugar Colonies; the Poverty, Weakness, and Decay of the British Sugar Colonies, and their vast Importance to the Trade, Navigation, Wealth, and Power of this Nation* (1736).

[38] Gee pointed out in 1721 the burden of the enumeration as follows: "If a merchant sends out a ship from London with a cargo to the Sugar Islands to barter against Sugar, he brings this sugar to London, the charges of freight, landing, housing, wastage, etc., may amount to 9 *s.* per hundred; if he ship it off to Spain or the Straits, the freight, wastage, etc., may amount to 4 *s.* and 6 *d.* per hundred more. But if he can carry it directly from the Sugar Islands to Spain or the Straits, it will scarcely exceed 6 *s.* per hundred. If the sugar dont sell for above 20 *s.* per hundred, the merchant loses by this round-about voyage nearly forty per cent." Memorial to the Board of Trade, October 27, 1721, C. O. 323: 8, L 24. Ashley computed the difference at thirty per cent. and Robertson does the same, *A Supplement*, p. 16; *An Enquiry*, p. 17. Dr. Pitman calls my attention to the existence in London of a Sugar Trust, the United Company of Grocers and Sugar Bakers, which upheld enumeration as placing the planters more or less at its mercy. Petitions against enumeration were presented to the House of Commons on March 31, 1735 (*Commons Journal*, XXII. 439), and the subject was debated at considerable length. Calls were made for statistical returns and other evidence, including Torriano's letter of 1724 (pp. 444, 449–450, 451, 457, 488, 549–550, 590, 618), but the bill itself was not presented until 1739. See note 40.

the high duties in England upon all tropical staples, sugar, cocoa, coffee, and ginger. They declared with great justice that Great Britain's policy was illiberal and her regulation of trade selfish as compared with that of the French government, which by the decrees of 1726 and 1727 allowed free export to Spain and the Straits. They warned the British authorities that just as France already controlled the indigo trade, so would her merchants soon monopolize other tropical staples, if free export were not permitted and the duties lowered. Other causes were assigned for the prevailing depression, but these two were deemed by all the *fons et origo mali.*

The matter came up in Parliament in 1739. The West Indian planters recommended the passage of a bill allowing general and free exportation, reductions of duty and excise, remission of the four and a half per cent., direct trade with Ireland, and further relief in the re-exporting of refined sugar. But it was manifest to all that no bill could pass embodying such terms as these. The Board of Trade had already recommended a limited freedom of trade[39] and the House of Commons was ready to make a limited concession. During the course of the debate there was a call for all kinds of information bearing on the subject. The Treasury, the Commissioners of Customs, the Board of Trade, and the Victualling Board were ordered to furnish statistics. Protests were heard and petitions read from sugar refiners, merchants, ship-owners, shipwrights, ship-chandlers, and others, not only of London but also of Liverpool, Whitehaven, and other ports and manufacturing centres, against free exportation, consequently the terms of the bill were modified and only a restricted freedom granted.[40] The bill as finally

[39] "With respect to the charges of our Navigation, it would be impossible to give our Traders any relief in this particular, without breaking thro' some established customs, and making great alterations in several laws, by which many general charges have been imposed upon shipping, for the repairs of Peers and Lighthouses; but they have long been desirous of carrying their sugars directly to all the European markets, to the southward of Cape Finisterre; and we would humbly submit it to your Lordships, whether such a Liberty might not be granted under proper Restriction." *Representation from the Board of Trade to the House of Lords,* January 14, 1735, p. 14. For Cape Finisterre as marking the southern boundary of the British Seas, see Fuller, *The Sovereignty of the Sea,* pp. 502, 510, 515, 519, 521.

[40] *Commons Journal,* XXIII. 284, 292, 297, 298, 318, 329, 338–339, 340, 343, 344, 349, 351, 361, 365–366, 368, 370, 372–373; amended by the Lords, p. 378. For statistics collected by the Treasury, see Andrews, *Guide,* II. 248–249. For the various reports and petitions, Andrews and Davenport, *Guide,* pp. 211–212. It is worthy of note that in the course of the debate one of the French decrees of 1726 was read from Gee's *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered,* and it is probable that Gee's opinions on the general subject, as stated in that work (pp. 43–53), were given due weight.

passed[41] permitted West Indian planters to send their sugar, but sugar only, to foreign ports south of Cape Finisterre, in ships built in and sailing from Great Britain and navigated according to law. As by this bill sugar was placed in the same class with rice, we have here another instance of the gradual breaking down of the strict mercantilist policy in favor of the Northern Colonies. But the measure as a whole was so clogged with restrictions as to be of little benefit to the sugar planters.[42] It excluded colonial-built ships, which could always carry more cheaply than those of England; it imposed a burdensome licensing system; it required that a ship discharging her lading south of Cape Finisterre should return by way of England, under the terms of the act of 1663; and it admitted no direct trade with Ireland. The chief grievance, however, was the confining of the foreign market to the least desirable parts of the European world. The best sugar markets were in the north, not in the south where the French and Portuguese had control of the trade. The benefits of the law were slight.[43] The

[41] 12 George II., c. 30.

[42] "There has lately been past an Act in the Thirteenth of the present King, entitled An Act for granting a Liberty to carry Sugars, . . . But the Legislature thought it necessary to clog it with such Restrictions that we do not find it is like to prove of any great Benefit to the Sugar-Colonies; and indeed many of the Merchants were at first clear of Opinion that it would not, which, however, the Planters on the other Hand were ready to impute to Views of Self-Interest, in respect to Commissions." *Caribbeana,* II. 62, note. That the Northern Colonies deemed it detrimental to their interests also may be inferred from the comment of Gov. Wanton of Rhode Island in writing to Gov. Belcher of Massachusetts. "I am desired by our General Assembly to acquaint Your Excelcy That a Vote is pass'd directing our Agent in Conjunction with the others strenuously to oppose at the next Session of Parliament the new additional Act relating to the Sugar Colonies in the W. Indies, which if pass'd will prove extreamly prejudicial and hurtful to the Trade of all the Northern Colonies, and therefore desire That Your Excelcy will please to move it to Your Genl Court That proper Instructions might be given for that purpose." November 12, 1739. Kimball, *Correspondence,* I. 123. An identical letter was sent to the governor of Connecticut, *Talcott Papers* (Conn. Hist. Soc. *Coll.*), V. 186

[43] Though the preamble to the act of 1742 declared that the act of 1739 had proved "very beneficial to the colonies", the evidence in the case does not bear out this statement. Dr. Pitman says that it resulted in very little actual trade in sugar directly to the Continent, though it did raise prices in England and enhanced somewhat the power and influence of the West Indian planters residing there. Proof of this may be found in the debates on the proposed increase of the sugar duty in 1744, when a bill to that effect was defeated in Parliament (*Parl. Hist.,* XIII. 640–641, 652–655). Arguments against this proposed duty, which continued imminent even after defeat, can be found in *The State of the Sugar Trade* (1747), which shows "the dangerous consequences that must attend any additional duty thereon", and asserts that the planters gained nothing from the rise of prices. Dr. Pitman shows that the licenses required by the act of 1739 were a serious obstacle and were little utilized, only forty-eight being taken out from 1739 to 1753, and of these but five were used, by Jamaica

French competition appeared to increase unchecked, and the restrictions upon the sugar trade seemed as burdensome as before. During the decade that followed but two concessions were made by the British Parliament to the continued demands of the Sugar Islands. In 1742 colonial-built ships were admitted to the privileges of the act of 1739,[44] and in 1748, the drawback on sugar, refined in Great Britain and exported to the Continent, was increased,[45] a measure manifestly passed quite as much in the interest of the sugar refiners as of the sugar planters. England persistently refused to lower her duties or to ameliorate in any way the burden of the four and a half per cent., though the colonists for a century had urged her to do so,[46] beginning their organized attack as early as 1732 upon the coffee duty and continuing to the end of the period.[47] Decker once said, "'Tis our own covetous folly that can undo us", and there is much in England's commercial policy of the eighteenth century to demonstrate the truth of this remark.

The situation in 1750 was to the mercantilists no better than it had been in 1731. The latter were ready to prove that the British traders in North America had for years carried on a large and extensive trade not only with the foreign colonies in America but with the French and Dutch in Europe directly; that they imported vast quantities of sugar, rum, and molasses yearly from the French and Dutch sugar colonies into the northern British colonies in direct violation of the Molasses Act, and had carried this trade to such a height as to purchase vessels destined for this trade only, of which there were three hundred employed annually, and to settle correspondents and factors in the French islands to facilitate this commerce; that they carried on this trade with and for the benefit of France, to the injury of the British Sugar Colonies, draining them

and Barbadoes planters only. The general situation at this time is summed up in *The Present State of the British and French Trade to Africa and America considered and compared, with some Propositions in favour of the Trade of Great Britain* (1745), and in *A Letter to a Member of Parliament concerning the Importance of our Sugar Colonies to Great Britain, by a Gentleman who resided in America* (1745). The titles of other pamphlets of this period are given in the first part of this paper, note 44.

[44] 15 George II. c. 35, § 5.

[45] 21 George II. c. 2, § 7. See a paper in Public Record Office, Treasury 1, 331.

[46] Wood wrote in 1718, "It is certain that the high duties are such a weight upon the Industry of our Merchants, that it hinders us from Enlarging our Trade to the utmost it might otherwise be capable of. Therefore it may deserve Consideration, whether if parts of the customs were taken off, of some sorts of imported Goods, and of all our Manufactures exported, it might not be very beneficial to the Nation." *Survey of Trade,* p. 219.

[47] *Commons Journal,* XXI. 829, 845–846, 855, 866, 869, 911.

of their money which was spent in the foreign colonies for tropical products, or for European and East Indian commodities that should have been obtained only through English ports; and lastly, that they went so far as to lend themselves to the corrupting influence of the foreign planters and to become instruments for introducing foreign sugars, under the denomination and disguise of British, into Great Britain itself.[48] In 1750 the assembly of Jamaica sent a remonstrance to England against this trade. In February, 1752, a committee of eight, representing a group of merchant planters in England, appeared before the Board of Trade and at the same time sent a petition to the Treasury, asserting that there were then under seizure by the custom house officers at the port of Bristol sugars entered as British from New York, that were really and bona fide from the French colonies. These men begged that a bill be presented in Parliament for the purpose of prohibiting entirely this traffic, thus reverting to the purpose of the measure defeated twenty years before.[49] But the effort failed. The Privy Council, instead of advising a resort to Parliament for a repeal of the Molasses Act and the reconsideration of the defeated measure of 1731, contented itself with writing a circular letter to all the governors of the Sugar Colonies directing them "to use their best endeavours to procure the passage of [colonial laws] containing regulations for preventing this illicit and clandestine traffic".[50] It was an innocuous and nerveless device for evading responsibility, and

[48] Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 33030, ff. 401–402, "State of an Illegal and Clandestine Trade carried on by the British Northern Colonies in America". Similar statements are made in the Jamaican's account, "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Scarcity of Money", Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 30163, ff. 23–24. The sending of French sugars for British was complained of as early as 1720. See above, note 13.

[49] Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 34729, f. 350. A draft of the bill, which was designed to take effect in 1755, is given on ff. 352–353, and is followed by reasons in its support. The latter attempt to show that the traffic was carried on on a vast scale and that all sugars exported from the Northern Colonies must be French, ff. 354–355. The original petition to the Treasury is in Public Record Office, Treasury 1 : 338.

[50] The relations between the northern British colonies and the French and Dutch West India colonies from 1756 to 1763 do not concern us here. Acting on the authority of the Privy Council's instruction, the assembly of Jamaica passed an act in 1752, re-enacted it in 1756, and passed it again in 1759, prohibiting absolutely the importation of all foreign sugar, rum, and molasses, thus endeavoring to accomplish locally what it had hoped Parliament would do for all the Sugar Colonies. In 1762 the same assembly passed an explanatory act, making such importation a felony and punishable with death without benefit of clergy. It is needless to say that the Board of Trade strongly recommended the disallowance of these acts (C. O. 138: 22, pp. 190–239), but they are important as showing the intense feeling prevailing on this subject in the British West Indies. *Acts of the Privy Council, Col.*, IV. 517–518.

to the West Indian planters it must have seemed but the "palliative cure" of which they had been afraid in 1731.

The act of 1733 and the supplemental measures that followed from 1739 to 1752 were weak and impotent blows at a powerful enemy, whom all the mercantilists characterized as England's greatest rival in the commercial world. Though the pamphleteers greatly exaggerated the menace of French competition, which was actually dangerous only in the sugar trade, their writings were influential at the time and served to spread the belief that France was outfooting England in nearly all parts of the world, was in control of the best markets, and was threatening British commercial leadership in America, the West Indies, Africa, and India. To these men it seemed a crime against England that the French should be aided in their race for commercial supremacy by the northern British colonies, which continued without cessation their practice of importing sugar, rum, and molasses from the foreign colonies and of exporting these foreign staples to England as if they were British products. It was inevitable that continued advance on the part of the French, either real or apparent, should lead to arms, just as a similar advance on the part of the Dutch had ended in war a century before, and that something stronger than legislative enactments should be resorted to, in order to break the hold that France, to all appearances, was gaining on the territory and trade of the western world. The commercial conflict, which had known no truce in the years from 1700 to 1750, merged almost imperceptibly, but none the less certainly, into that great military and naval struggle, known as the Seven Years' War.

Charles M. Andrews.

THE UNITED STATES AND SPAIN IN 1822

During the second and third decades of the nineteenth century the magnificent empire of Spain in America split into states which proclaimed their independence of the mother-country. From 1810 to 1822 the rebellious colonists sent emissaries to the United States to seek aid and to plead for the recognition of their independence. But the government of the United States did not receive these envoys officially: it strove to remain neutral in the protracted struggle between Spain and her colonies. Meanwhile, in cabinet councils and in Congress the question was raised whether the executive or Congress ought to lead the way in recognizing the independence of the nascent states. This study, which considers the action taken by the United States in 1822 with regard to the recognition of the independence of these states, will accordingly deal with the immediate antecedents of the Monroe Doctrine message. It will be seen that the evidence at hand furnishes some ground for the view that Spain foresaw the promulgation of such a doctrine by the United States and hence warned England as well as other European powers against an American political system in contrast with the European system under the aegis of the Holy Alliance.

On January 30, 1822, the House of Representatives asked President Monroe for information concerning "the political condition" of the revolted provinces of Spanish America and "the state of war between them and Spain".[1] On March 8, 1822, the President responded by a special message, which was accompanied by documents illustrating conditions in Spain as well as in Colombia, Chile, Peru, Buenos Aires, and Mexico. After reviewing the policy which the United States had pursued towards the revolutionists, Monroe declared that five states of Spanish America were "in the full enjoyment of their independence"; that there was "not the most remote prospect of their being deprived of it"; and that these new governments had now "a claim to recognition by other Powers, which ought not to be resisted". Monroe affirmed that the delay of the United States in deciding to recognize the independence of these states had given "an unequivocal proof" to Spain, as well as to other powers, "of the high respect entertained by the United States" for the rights of the mother-country. He held that the spread of the insurrection over the Spanish dominions in America

[1] *Annals of Congress*, 17 Cong., 1 sess., I. 825–828.

would reconcile Spain to a separation from her colonies. He declared that the United States desired to act with the powers of Europe in regard to the recognition of Spanish-American independence. Cautiously the President declared that it was not the intention of his government to alter the friendly relations existing between the United States and the warring countries, but "to observe . . . the most perfect neutrality between them". The upshot of Monroe's message was the suggestion that, if Congress concurred in his views, it would see "the propriety of making the necessary appropriations" to carry them into effect.[2]

On March 19, 1822, the Committee on Foreign Relations, which had been considering Monroe's message, reported to the House that the nations of Spanish America were *de facto* independent. The judgment of the committee in favor of the recognition of their independence from Spain was based upon this alleged fact. An apprehension that the recognition of Spanish-American independence might "injuriously affect our peaceful and friendly relations with the nations of the other hemisphere" was lightly dismissed, while the hope was expressed that European nations might follow the example of the United States. It was maintained that the claims of Spain to sovereignty over the American colonies had been given "the most respectful attention". It was declared that recognition by the United States could neither affect Spain's "rights nor impair her means" in the accomplishment of her policy. With unanimity the committee declared that it was "just and expedient to acknowledge the independence of the several nations of Spanish America". The committee accordingly proposed two resolutions: first, that the House of Representatives concur with the President that the American provinces of Spain which had declared and were enjoying their independence "ought to be recognized by the United States as independent nations"; and, second, that the Committee of Ways and Means should report a bill making an appropriation which would enable the President "to give due effect to such recognition".[3]

The committee's report provoked a spirited discussion in the House. After a slight change in the phraseology of the first resolution, both resolutions passed the House on March 28, the first resolution being carried by a vote of 167 to one, while the second resolution was passed unanimously.[4] Accordingly a bill was soon framed which made an appropriation for diplomatic missions to the independent nations south of the United States.[5] After some hesita-

[2] *American State Papers, Foreign Relations,* IV. 818, 819.
[3] *Annals of Congress,* 17 Cong., 1 sess., II. 1314–1320.
[4] *Ibid.,* pp. 1403, 1404.
[5] *Ibid.,* pp. 1444, 1518, 1526, 1530.

tion, caused by the news that the Cortes of Spain had expressed its disapproval of the recognition of the independence of the Spanish colonies by other nations,[6] the Senate approved the policy of recognition. On May 4, 1822, Monroe signed a bill which appropriated one hundred thousand dollars to defray the expenses of "such Missions to the independent nations on the American continent" as the President might deem proper.[7]

By this act the United States announced its intention to acknowledge the independence of the revolted colonies of Spain in America which stretched from the parallel of forty-two degrees, north latitude, to Cape Horn. With the exception of the Portuguese monarchy seated at Rio de Janeiro,[8] the North American republic was the first member of the family of nations to extend the hand of fellowship to the new Hispanic states. The significance of this acknowledgment has not been adequately noticed by historical writers in America or Europe.

In the spring of 1822, Spain's ambassador in the United States was Joaquín de Anduaga. The day after Monroe's message recommending the recognition of the independence of the Spanish-American provinces was transmitted to Congress, Anduaga sent to Secretary Adams a lively protest. He said that, after the immense sacrifices which Spain had made to preserve friendly relations with the United States, President Monroe's proposal had much surprised him. He declared that the condition of these provinces did not entitle them to such recognition:

"Where, then, are those Governments which ought to be recognized? where the pledges of their stability? . . . where the right of the United States to sanction and declare legitimate a rebellion without cause, and the event of which is not even decided?"

He declared that the nations of Europe should await the issue of the contest between Spain and her revolted colonies and thus avoid doing Spain a gratuitous injury:

"The sentiments which the message ought to excite in the breast of every Spaniard can be no secret to you. Those which the King

[6] Adams, *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, V. 489.

[7] *Annals of Congress*, 17 Cong., 1 sess., II. 2603, 2604. This recognition is discussed in Moore, *A Digest of International Law*, I. 85, 86; Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain, Diplomacy*, pp. 152–155; Paxson, *The Independence of the South-American Republics*, pp. 170–177; Latané, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America*, p. 61; McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States*, V. 42, 43; Turner, *Rise of the New West* (*The American Nation*, vol. XIV.), p. 207.

[8] Portugal recognized Buenos Aires in 1821. *Registro Oficial de la República Argentina*, I. 569, 570; Pereira da Silva, *Historia da Fundação do Imperio Brazileiro*, II. 280.

of Spain will experience at receiving a notification so unexpected will be doubtless very disagreeable."

With indignation the minister announced that the recognition of the independence of the revolted provinces by the United States could *"in no way now, or at any time, lessen or invalidate in the least the right of Spain to said provinces"*, or the right to employ any means in her power *"to reunite them to the rest of her dominions"*.[9]

On March 12, 1822, Anduaga sent to his government a copy of Monroe's message and of his protest. "It is difficult to describe", said Anduaga, "the general applause with which this message has been received here without distinction of party." He affirmed that this message had been referred by the House of Representatives to the Committee on Foreign Relations merely as a matter of form; the United States, after having secured the cession of Florida from Spain, had virtually decided to recognize the independence of all the revolted provinces.

> Although this action was foreseen by all intelligent persons at the time when the treaty of 1819 was negotiated, yet my indignation has been aroused by the perfidy and the effrontery of the government of the United States, which, after having secured from Spain the greatest and the most shameful sacrifices, has recognized these provinces, thus doing exactly what Spain by her fatal condescension wished to prevent.[10]

To appreciate the attitude which the Spanish government took towards this policy proclaimed by the United States, it should be remembered that, in 1822, Ferdinand VII. ruled Spain not as an absolute king, but as a constitutional monarch. In accordance with the constitution framed in 1812, the administration was in the hands of a responsible ministry. In important affairs the king was advised by a council of state composed of forty members. The legislative authority was vested in the king and in a Cortes composed of one house.[11] On February 13, 1822, the extraordinary Cortes had passed a decree concerning Spanish America which provided that the government should send commissioners to the revolted colonies who were to receive and to transmit to Madrid the proposals of the insurgents. This decree announced that the treaty signed at Córdoba on August 24, 1821, by the royalist commander, Juan O'Donojú, and the revolutionary leader, Agustín de Iturbide, which

[9] *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, IV. 845, 846. The reply of Adams is found, *ibid.*, p. 846.

[10] Anduaga to the secretary of state, March 12, 1822, Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

[11] The constitution of 1812 can be found in Dublan and Lozano, *Legislación Mexicana*, I. 349–379.

provided for the independence of New Spain from Old Spain, was illegal and void. This important decree provided that Spain should inform other governments "by means of a declaration" that she would always view the partial or absolute recognition of the independence of her transatlantic provinces as a violation of treaties.[12] The Spanish ambassadors at important European courts were instructed to bring to the attention of these courts the policy which Spain had thus formally announced.[13]

The government of the United States had apprehended that the policy of recognition might provoke Spain. On March 9, Adams sent to John Forsyth, the American ambassador at Madrid, a copy of Monroe's message. Adams told the ambassador that, if the Spaniards were displeased at this message, he was "to give every necessary explanation concerning it, and particularly that it resulted from a disposition in no wise unfriendly to Spain".[14] Soon after the news of Monroe's message reached Madrid, Forsyth heard that Francisco Martínez de la Rosa, a moderate liberal who was the Spanish secretary of state,[15] had spoken of that message as hostile to Spain and had described the report of the committee of the House of Representatives as "an attack upon legitimacy". Of his conversation with that minister in regard to the policy of the United States towards Spanish America, Forsyth said:

> He spoke with a great deal of warmth on the subject, said it was what, from the friendly conduct of the Spains to the United States they could not have expected,—in no state of circumstances could it have a friendly effect on the interests of this Govt.—that it appeared from the message itself, that, not satisfied with taking this step ourselves, we had been and still were instigating other Governments to do so likewise, and that the measure was adopted upon information incorrect in itself, and derived from sources of doubtful authority. . . . He considered it particularly injurious to Spain at this moment when they were about setting on foot a negotiation with the different parts of Spanish America.—He concluded by expressing an opinion that the Spanish-Americans were unequal to self-government and that their

[12] *Colección de los Decretos y Ordenes Generales expedidos por las Cortes*, VIII. 272–274.

[13] On the instructions to the ambassadors to England and Spain respectively, see Onis to Castlereagh, May 27, 1822, Public Record Office, Foreign Office Correspondence, Spain, 262; Argaiz to Nesselrode, St. Petersburg, March 6/18, 1822 (copy), Archivo General de Indias, Estado, Audiencia de México, 23. With regard to France and Prussia, see Torres Lanzas, *Independencia de América*, primera serie, V. 412.

[14] State Dept. MSS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Instructions to Ministers, 9.

[15] On conditions in Spain, see Altamira, "Spain (1815–1845)", in the *Cambridge Modern History*, X. 224–226.

Independence, instead of being accelerated, would be retarded by this act of our Government.[16]

In reply Forsyth defended the action of his government; he said that the message itself explained the basis for the recognition of the independence of the Spanish-American colonies; he affirmed that the attitude of Spain herself would determine whether or not this policy would injure her; he maintained that, if the Spaniards were "disposed to yield to circumstances and act prudently, it could do them no injury". Forsyth also told Martínez de la Rosa that, in communicating with certain other governments in regard to Spanish America, the United States had desired "that other powers more remotely concerned in the question, should express an opinion on it at the same time with ourselves, with a view to its effects on the policy" of Spain. Further, he alleged that the action of the United States had been taken in ignorance of the projected negotiations of Spain with her revolted colonies. Martínez de la Rosa's declaration that the Spanish Americans were unfit for self-government was met with the statement that, if this were true, they were not fit to live under the Spanish constitution.[17]

A multitude of documents in the archives of Spain testify that Spanish statesmen were grievously vexed at the policy announced by the United States and that Spanish diplomats anxiously strove to counteract the influence of that policy. On April 21 Ferdinand VII. sent an order to the council of state urging it to consider President Monroe's message to Congress of March 8; on the following day this state paper was referred to a committee.[18] On May 1 this startling message was discussed by the council of state. The majority of the councillors were of opinion that Anduaga had acted properly in regard to the message; that he should be ordered to absent himself from Washington without demanding his passports; and that he should protest energetically against the recognition of the independence of any of the transatlantic provinces of Spain. Further, the council decided that Spain should act circumspectly; that she should abstain openly from any measures which might indicate hostility towards the United States or provoke a war; but that she should quietly take every possible measure to improve her position by strengthening her navy.[19]

Meanwhile, Martínez de la Rosa had sent special instructions in

[16] Forsyth to Adams, May 20, 1822, State Dept. MSS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches from Ministers, Spain, 20.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Archivo Histórico Nacional, Actas del Concejo de Estado, 25 D.

[19] *Ibid.*

regard to Monroe's message to the Spanish envoys at various European courts. On April 22 he addressed identical despatches to Spain's ambassadors at Paris, London, and St. Petersburg. These ambassadors were reminded of the decree of the Spanish Cortes of February 13, 1822; and they were directed to protest vigorously against the policy of recognition proposed by President Monroe.[20] Three days later the Spanish secretary of state wrote instructions for the ambassadors in France, Prussia, Austria, Russia, England, Sweden, Holland, and Denmark informing them that Spain desired to counteract the effects of Monroe's message.[21]

To the chief legations of Spain in Europe there was also sent a paper which was entitled "a sketch of the condition of the different provinces of Spanish America according to the latest reports". This sketch was to be used in dealing with the cabinets of the various governments or in influencing public opinion in the different countries. It presented a Spanish version of conditions in the revolted provinces, a version which was in sharp contrast with the account presented in the message of President Monroe. In Mexico, the prestige of Agustin de Iturbide was declining; the complete triumph of the revolutionists in that country was problematical. On the Pacific coast of South America, José de San Martín was not in accord with his lieutenants; he had antagonized many Chileans, and made himself odious to the people of Lima. In the provinces of la Plata, the influence of the revolutionists did not extend far beyond the city of Buenos Aires; the rural provinces were distracted by factions; and Paraguay was in the grasp of a despot. In northern South America, Spanish generals were gaining victories; and a report was in circulation that Bolívar the liberator had died. Santo Domingo was torn by factions, while Cuba and Porto Rico were furnishing proofs of devoted loyalty to the mother-country.[22] In fine, those facts were marshalled in this sketch which supported the contention of the Spanish government that the revolution in America was doomed to fail.

On May 6, 1822, Martínez de la Rosa addressed identical instructions to the Spanish ambassadors in London, Paris, Vienna, St. Petersburg, and Berlin. These ambassadors were informed that the principal objects of their diplomacy should be:

> That the government to which you are accredited should not recog-

[20] Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

[21] Draft, *ibid.*

[22] "Estado de los diferentes paises de América segun las ultimas noticias", *ibid.*

nize, directly or indirectly, the *de facto* governments existing in the dissident provinces of America.

That it should not send to them, or receive from them, any public agents; or establish any diplomatic relations with them.

That it should give to the manifesto of his Catholic Majesty the most explicit and favorable reply which can be obtained with regard to its disposition to respect the rights of the Spanish nation in her American provinces by maintaining an absolutely passive position during the negotiations which are to be initiated by means of commissioners, and by not recognizing the independence of these provinces.

Spain's ambassadors at the courts of the Allies were also informed that, in the judgment of the Spanish government, the United States was about to recognize the independence of the revolted colonies. To neutralize the effects of this recognition these ambassadors were furnished with certain general arguments. They were directed to point out how badly the United States had treated Spain after that nation had sacrificed the Floridas. They were to comment upon the policy of the United States that aimed to isolate itself from European powers, and that wished to incite the American colonists to separate themselves from the nations of Europe. They were to intimate that the policy of the United States towards Spanish America was due to a desire to secure as a reward for the recognition of the new states special commercial advantages and privileges.

Special arguments were furnished for presentation to particular courts. To the courts of Austria and Prussia two special arguments might be presented: one, that it was wise to strengthen the stability of legitimate governments and not to furnish a new theatre for revolution in America; the other, that the recognition of the independence of the Spanish colonies would probably lead to the grant of special commercial privileges to some maritime power. To Russia might be given the intimation that she would gain special commercial advantages by the conservation of Spain's sovereignty in the New World. It was declared that the United States viewed the Russian settlements in America with jealousy and enmity. With regard to France, it was suggested that the emancipation of Spain's colonies in America would promote the emancipation of the French colonies; while it was intimated that, if Spain succeeded in pacifying the insurgents, France would secure many commercial advantages. It was urged that, if the Spanish colonies were emancipated, other nations than France would secure from the new states special commercial advantages. It was suggested that France, "the natural ally of Spain", should have a special interest in the preservation of Spanish rule in America. To England it might be argued that the

recognition of the independence of the new American states was not in harmony with the policy of neutrality which that power had followed during the struggle between Spain and her colonies; and that recognition by England would indicate that English policy had been frustrated by the United States.

> The doctrine and the conduct of the United States furnish convincing proof that because of their inclinations, interests, and policies the European colonies which become independent in America have a strong interest in seeing that the nations of Europe do not retain there any colonies or establishments subject to their rule. England is perhaps the power most interested in giving to this ulterior consideration its due weight. . . . The recognition of the independence of the dissident provinces will at once injure her international relations and will not improve the commercial relations of England with those regions.
>
> If these provinces become independent, it is almost certain that the United States will derive greater profit from that event than England. To this probable outcome many causes will contribute: such as the geographical location of the United States; its form of government; the greater resemblance of that government to the governments established in Spanish America; and the American interest which will constrain the United States to counterbalance the European interest in America.[23]

Obviously, Spain wished to inhibit any action by the European powers which would favor the independence of the states that were rising beyond the Atlantic.

In May, 1822, Martínez de la Rosa addressed to Spain's ambassadors at the principal European courts his manifesto concerning the condition of the revolted colonies in America. He reminded the powers of Europe that Napoleon's usurpation in Spain was the fundamental cause of the revolution in the American colonies—a revolution which the Spanish government anxiously wished to terminate. These powers were informed that, in accordance with the action of the Cortes, Ferdinand VII. had selected certain commissioners to proceed to the transatlantic provinces so that they might receive the proposals of the revolutionists and transmit them to Madrid:

> His Catholic Majesty does not present himself to the revolted colonies as a monarch who is angry with his offending subjects, but as a father who wishes to act as a pacific mediator in the dissensions of his children. . . . His Catholic Majesty flatters himself with the hope that this frank and generous conduct will save the American provinces from ages of misery and destruction: that it will prevent civil war and anarchy from obstructing the progress of their civilization and culture;

[23] "Instrucciónes reservados á los Representantes de S. M. en Londres, París, Viena, Petersburgo, y Berlin, Madrid, 6 de Mayo de 1822", Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

that it will prevent the depopulation, poverty, and immorality resulting from those large political oscillations which condemn one generation to misfortune without assuring repose or happiness to succeeding generations. . . . It is impossible to measure this influence [of American affairs in Europe] or the alteration which it will produce in the reciprocal relations of the Old and the New Worlds; but his Catholic Majesty does not hesitate to affirm that the negotiation which will determine the destiny of the Spanish-American provinces and will arrest the blind and impetuous course of revolution will be one of the greatest of blessings for the civilized world. . . .

Perhaps there will be some shallow minds who will consider that a nation has been founded and a solid and stable government established in each American province which has declared its independence; and who, without considering the obstacles of any sort, or the principles of public law, or the best-known maxims of the law of nations, believe that the *mere fact* that a province has separated from the state of which it forms a legitimate part and that it maintains an isolated and independent existence invests it with the right to be recognized by other nations as an independent power.

But fortunately the governments of Europe have learned by sad experience the effects which are produced by such an overthrow of principles; they realize that the consequences of spreading such principles are not less fatal to legitimate governments than to the integrity of nations; and they are acutely aware of the effects upon Europe of sanctioning in America, as some persons pretend to do, the indefinite right of insurrection.

Consequently his Catholic Majesty believes that there are interested in this problem other nations besides those which possess transatlantic colonies and establishments to which the same theory might be applied which some persons desire to legitimate with regard to the Spanish provinces in America; for he considers this affair to be intimately connected with those conservative principles which afford security to all governments and guarantees to society.

It was argued that Spain, rich, powerful, yet inoffensive, would influence the European balance of power favorably. It was declared that Spain was now convinced of the necessity of a more liberal colonial policy: since the establishment of the constitutional government, Spanish laws and regulations had favored the emigration of foreigners into the Spanish provinces in America and freedom of commerce with those dominions.

By these simple and natural means his Catholic Majesty is enabled to remove the only obstacle which could prevent perfect harmony between the policy of Spain and the policy of other [European] nations. The Spanish government, solid, stable, and recognized as a faithful observer of treaties, is disposed to negotiate with the revolted colonies in America and offers to other nations the greatest commercial opportunities: under these circumstances, even though the question were reduced to a simple calculation of financial advantage, it would be impossible to designate an object which could serve as a counterpoise on the other side.

While Spain is trying to terminate a domestic misunderstanding, the inviolable respect which she entertains for the rights of other nations inspires her with a just confidence that she will be treated with the same consideration. She cannot even suspect, in regard to the powers which deserve to maintain friendship and harmony with her, that any rash step will be taken which might imply a supposition that the question is already solved, the decision of which belongs only to Spain in the exercise of those legitimate and recognized rights which she has never renounced. The very measures which have been taken to induce the powers of Europe to recognize the independence of the revolted colonies of America will afford to the cabinets of the Allies a signal occasion to sanction the fundamental principles upon which are founded the integrity of national territory, the peace of nations, and the morality of governments.[24]

This exposition was originally prepared in accordance with the decree of the Cortes dated February 13, 1822. Although it was not completed until after the news of Monroe's message of March 8 had reached Spain,[25] yet neither that provocative message nor the government of the United States was mentioned therein. To that message this exposition was, nevertheless, in part, a counterblast. When this exposé of Spain's policy became known in Madrid, it gave rise to a conjecture that Spanish America was "to be restored to its ancient dependence. And the United States is to be taught obedience to the maxims of Government prevailing in civilized and enlightened Europe."[26] This exposition of the policy of the constitutional government of Spain towards her revolted colonies was published at Madrid; it was transmitted to the courts of the Allies; but to contemporaries in the United States, it remained almost unknown.[27] Although a translation of this important document was

[24] "Manifiesto sobre el estado de las Provincias disidentes de América, en Madrid, Mayo de 1822", Archivo General de Indias Estado, América en General, 5. It may be interesting to consider in connection with this manifesto the views concerning Spanish America expressed by John Quincy Adams in a letter to A. H. Everett, December 29, 1817, in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XI. 113, 114. Perhaps the clearest statement in regard to the principles underlying the policy pursued by the United States towards the revolution in Spanish America, however, was made on August 24, 1818, by Secretary Adams to President Monroe; see "Memorandum upon the Power to Recognize the Independence of a New Foreign State", by Mr. Hale, *Senate Document No. 56*, 54 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 2, 53. In part, this is also found in Moore, *A Digest of International Law*, I. 78, 79.

[25] Martínez de la Rosa to Spain's ambassadors in Paris, London, and St. Petersburg, April 22, 1822, A. G. I., *ubi supra*. See further, Torres Lanzas, *Independencia de América*, primera serie, V. 442, 443.

[26] Forsyth to Adams, June 23, 1822, State Dept. MSS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches from Spain, 20.

[27] A copy of this manifesto was sent to Forsyth by Martínez de la Rosa on June 21, 1822. Forsyth sent a copy of the manifesto to Adams on June 23, *ibid.* On August 17, 1822, Niles mentioned a manifesto purporting to contain the views of Spain in regard to Spanish America; but he did not consider it as genuine, and hence did not publish it. *Niles' Weekly Register*, XXII. 386.

published in the *British and Foreign State Papers* more than fifty years ago,[28] yet its historical import has not been appreciated, so far as the writer is aware, until the present day.[29]

Soon after the news of Monroe's message reached Paris, Spain's ambassador, the Marqués de Casa Yrujo, sought Vicomte Matthieu de Montmorency, the French minister of foreign affairs, to remind him that Spain had declared the treaty of Córdoba null; to declare that she retained all her rights over her transatlantic provinces; and that she expected France, "in accordance with the principles of legitimacy", not to follow the suggestions which had been made by the United States in regard to the independence of the revolted colonies. At once Montmorency assured the marquis that, with regard to these colonies, France would not follow the example of the United States.[30] On May 9 the Spanish secretary of state sent to Casa Yrujo a copy of the manifesto concerning the Spanish-American colonies with instructions immediately to bring this state paper to the attention of the French government.[31] Hence, on May 20, Casa Yrujo sent a copy of this manifesto to Montmorency.[32] On May 24 Casa Yrujo reported to his government a conference with Montmorency regarding the recognition of the Spanish colonies in which he had used the arguments furnished in the circular instructions of May 6. According to the ambassador's report, after speaking of the probable policy of England towards Spanish America, Montmorency said:

"That France would be glad to see Spain employ the only measure which offered a hope of the best results for Spain, for Europe, and for America, that is, to send to Mexico one of our *infantes*. He indicated to me that France would lend us all the aid necessary to carry out this plan."[33]

In fact, during the age of the congresses, the favorite solution of France for the vexatious problem of the Spanish colonies was the

[28] *British and Foreign State Papers,* IX. 889–894.

[29] The manifesto is noticed by Stern, *Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871,* II. 277, 278.

[30] Casa Yrujo to Martínez de la Rosa, April 16, 1822, Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5. Gallatin's account of the reception of Monroe's message in Europe is found in Adams, *Writings of Albert Gallatin,* II. 240. Certain Parisian newspapers commented upon the policy of the United States towards Spanish America; see especially, *Le Courrier Français,* April 13 and April 15, 1822; *Le Journal des Débats,* April 17, 1822; and *La Gazette de France,* April 27, 1822.

[31] Martínez de la Rosa to Casa Yrujo, May 9, 1822, Archivo Histórico Nacional, Estado, 6846.

[32] Casa Yrujo to Montmorency, May 20, 1822, *ibid.*

[33] Casa Yrujo to Martínez de la Rosa, May 24, 1822, Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

establishment of monarchies in America under Bourbon princes, who might hold their kingdoms as appanages of Spain.[34]

Perhaps the hope of inducing Spain to accept such a project was partly responsible for the intimation which was given to Casa Yrujo by a subordinate official in the department of foreign affairs to the effect that France would not pledge herself to refrain from recognizing the independence of the revolted Spanish colonies for an indefinite period.[35] Replying to Spain's manifesto early in June, Montmorency informed Casa Yrujo that France would make no premature decision; her attitude towards Spain was too amicable to allow her to entertain any other desire than that the discussion in regard to the Spanish colonies should terminate without injuring the interests or the prosperity of Spain.[36]

Early in June, 1822, the question of the recognition of the independence of the new governments in America was also seriously considered at the court of Francis I. by the Austrian councillor of state, Friedrich von Gentz, and by Prince Metternich.[37] This momentous question was also the subject of conversation between Metternich and Spain's minister at the court of Vienna, Mariano de Carrero. On June 8, Carrero reported to Martínez de la Rosa that Metternich had expressed his disapproval of the revolts in Spanish America and of all steps which looked towards the recognition of the *de facto* governments.[38] Possibly it was a vivid recollection of the action of the North American republic in regard to the independence of the Spanish colonies that provoked Gentz to say of the United States on September 21, 1823: "This ill-omened stranger has already nestled deeply enough into every nook and cranny of the old continent."[39]

At the court of Prussia Monroe's message caused conferences between the Spanish ambassador at Berlin, Joaquín Zamorano, and Count Bernstorff, the foreign minister of Frederick William III.

[34] See further Casa Yrujo to Evaristo San Miguel, November 28, 1822, Archivo Histórico Nacional, Estado, 6844; Villanueva, *La Monarquía en América: Fernando VII. y los Nuevos Estados*, pp. 136, 137, citing the French archives; *Oeuvres Complètes de Châteaubriand*, XII. 397.

[35] Casa Yrujo to Martínez de la Rosa, May 24, 1822, Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

[36] Montmorency to Casa Yrujo, June 9, 1822, Archivo Histórico Nacional, Estado, 6846.

[37] *Tagebücher von Friedrich von Gentz*, III. 49, 50.

[38] Carrero to Martínez de la Rosa, June 8, 1822, Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

[39] *Briefe von und an Friedrich von Gentz*, vol. III., part II., p. 49. For the views of Gentz and Metternich on Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, see Robertson, "The Monroe Doctrine Abroad in 1823–1824", in the *American Political Science Review*, VI. 559–561.

At an interview in the end of May, Zamorano urged that Spain had an incontestable right to her transatlantic colonies; and he maintained that the action of the United States in regard to recognition was premature. Zamorano reported to Martínez de la Rosa that Bernstorff declared that Prussia would adhere to her policy of opposition to the recognition of the independence of any of the revolted colonies.[40]

On May 30 Zamorano sent to Count Bernstorff a copy of Spain's manifesto on Spanish America.[41] In the Prussian minister's reply dated June 7, he declared that the status of that vast and rich country would have a decisive influence upon the fortunes of two hemispheres. The nations which were friendly to Spain desired that she would find means to reconcile her rights with the real needs and the legitimate wishes of her American colonists.

> The cabinet of Madrid ought to recollect that, on more than one occasion, when the allied courts expressed their wishes and their desires with regard to the Spanish colonies, they manifested a friendly disposition to aid Spain by all those measures which might re-establish order, peace, and happiness in Spanish America. These courts entertain the same desire for the success of the system which his Majesty, the king of the Spains, now proposes to follow for the pacification of the Spanish colonies. . . . If this system enables his Catholic Majesty to attain his end, it will be a benefit to all Europe and the allies of Spain will agree to sanction it.[42]
>
> [42] Bernstorff to Zamorano (copy), June 7, 1822, *ibid.*

At a conference which he subsequently held with Bernstorff, the Spanish ambassador evidently received the assurance that Prussia would treat the revolted provinces in America as colonies of Spain.[43]

In the end of May, Spain's ambassador at St. Petersburg, Pedro Alcántara Argaiz, expressed to the Russian chancellor, Count Nesselrode, the surprise and displeasure of Ferdinand VII. at the action of the United States in regard to Spanish America. The Greek Capodistrias, adjunct secretary of foreign affairs and an opponent of Metternich's policy, evidently intimated to Argaiz that it would now be difficult for Spain to negotiate with the *de facto* governments in Spanish America.[44] On June 10 Argaiz sent to Nesselrode a copy of Spain's manifesto touching the condition of the revolted

[40] Zamorano to Martínez de la Rosa, April 30, 1822, Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

[41] Zamorano to Bernstorff, May 30, 1822 (copy), *ibid.*

[43] Zamorano to Martínez de la Rosa, June 8, 1822, *ibid.*

[44] Argaiz to Martínez de la Rosa, June 2, 1822, *ibid.* On Capodistrias see "Aperçu de ma carrière publique, depuis 1798 jusqu' à 1822" *Sbornik Russkago Istoritcheskago Obshchestva* (publications of the Imperial Russian Historical Society), III. 289, 290.

colonies.[45] Two days later Argaiz addressed to the Russian chancellor a letter enclosing two confidential notes which concerned Spanish America. In one of these notes the ambassador drew his arguments mainly from Spain's circular instructions of May 6.[46] In the other note, Argaiz spoke of "the conception which his Catholic Majesty entertained of the noble character of his august ally, the Emperor Alexander", and of Ferdinand's recollections of "the equitable and conciliatory policy" which the emperor had followed in other matters relating to the Spanish colonies. Then Argaiz criticized Monroe's message, evidently recapitulating the protests which he had made in his interview with Nesselrode:

> The content of the message of the president of the United States has furnished sufficient arguments to destroy the unfavorable impression which the inaccurate narration of the facts there mentioned will produce. In the documents designed to furnish a justification for that message the statement is made that no news has yet been received from Mr. Prevost, commissioner of the United States at Lima. It is therefore natural to conclude that we do not yet know with exactness the actual condition of that province. . . . According to the admission of the president himself, the news which the American government has in regard to Mexico is not more authentic. A private letter from a citizen of the United States is . . . a shaky foundation for the opinion which that government has formed in regard to the condition of that vast country. . . .
>
> Not only is the political and the military condition of Spain's dominions beyond the seas as presented in this message inaccurate; but the inferences which have been deduced therefrom are pernicious and the maxims there developed are contrary to public law. . . . The keen discernment of your excellency will have comprehended all the inconveniences attached to the adoption of such a theory in regard to the insurrection of any integral part of a state as well as the disadvantages which would result if America sanctions maxims opposed to those principles which are professed in Europe. What will be the result if the powers of Europe that are interested in the conservation of order and in the maintenance of the fundamental maxims of the law of nations allow this unexpected conduct on the part of the United States? In particular, should those nations which possess colonies regard the question which is agitated in Spain to an extent as their own? And if one or two maritime powers favor the emancipation of the provinces of Spanish America in order that they may derive all the advantages arising therefrom, will this suit the interests of the nations of the Old World?

Accompanying this critique was a report of the condition of Spanish America based upon information which had been received by Spain. In conclusion, the imperial government was asked to re-

[45] Argaiz to Nesselrode, May 29/June 10, 1882 (copy), Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

[46] "No. 4" (copy), *ibid.*

spect the rights of Spain and to refrain from any action which might interfere with her attempt to pacify the revolted colonies by amicable negotiations.[47]

Count Nesselrode's reply was made on June 25, 1822:

> I have placed under the eyes of the emperor, my master, the communications which you have addressed to his Majesty's cabinet in regard to the measures adopted by the United States for the recognition of the independence of the Spanish colonies of America.
>
> His Catholic Majesty ought not to question the desire which the emperor entertains of seeing this beautiful and rich part of the Spanish dominions prosper under the laws of a monarch whose paternal solicitude has for a long time been occupied with the mode of assuring them a peaceable and happy future.
>
> Ferdinand VII. ought to be convinced by the slight attention which has been paid in Europe to the proceedings of the agents of the revolted American provinces and by the communications which his cabinet has received from several European courts, that the resolutions of the Allied powers will not tend to decide before the proper time, or against the wishes of Spain, the question to which she attaches such legitimate importance. In this conjuncture, as in all others, the emperor will not depart in the least from the principles of loyalty, of justice, and of moderation which direct European policy and which he has had occasion to develop more than once in his relations of friendship with your august sovereign.[48]

Such was the response of the author of the Holy Alliance, whose influence Spain hoped to use to thwart any measures which England might be projecting with regard to the Spanish colonies.[49]

Monroe's message naturally provoked correspondence between the Spanish ambassador in London, Luis de Onis, and Lord Castlereagh, the English secretary for foreign affairs.

On May 7, 1822, Onis addressed a note to Castlereagh containing observations upon that message which were drawn mainly from his instructions of April 22. The Spanish ambassador di-

[47] "No. 3" (copy), Archivo General de Indias, Estado, América en General, 5.

[48] "No. 5" (copy), *ibid.* Monroe's message recommending the recognition of the independence of the Spanish-American states was also the subject of conversation between Henry Middleton, the minister of the United States at St. Petersburg, and the Russian government. To one of Russia's ministers Middleton expressed the hope that this message "might be correctly understood by the Emperor". He expressed the conviction that this step could only have been taken after a full and mature consideration of the subject and that such action was to be expected because of the geographical and commercial position of the United States. The reply of the Russian minister led Middleton to believe that he "in some degree assented to the justness" of his observations, Middleton to Adams, July 8/20, 1822, State Department MSS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches from Russia, 9. For the views of Nesselrode, as expressed to Tuyll in July, 1822, see "Correspondence of the Russian Ministers in Washington, 1818–1825", in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XVIII. 341–342.

[49] Martínez de la Rosa to Argaiz, May 10, 1822, A. G. I., *ubi supra.*

rected attention to the decree of the Cortes of February 13, 1822. He declared that Ferdinand VII. wished to preserve harmony with the King of England in regard to Spanish America while his cabinet prepared and transmitted "an exposition, or manifesto, disclosing more fully the rights and views of Spain in regard to the most important question which the president of the Anglo-American republic has resolved to precipitate".

> Such is the nature of the message of the president of the United States that it furnishes sufficient reasons to blot out the impression which it might produce. The facts presented as a basis for the solution of the problem are either distorted or lack the necessary exactness. . . . But if the military and political condition of our provinces in America as described in that message is false, the consequences deduced therefrom are absurd and the maxims enunciated are contrary to the fundamental principles of public law. What would be the results of accepting such a theory in regard to the insurrection of any integral part of a state? What would be the evils produced by sanctioning principles in America which are contrary to the principles that are sanctioned in Europe? And what would be the result of such an irregular and risky conduct upon the policy of those nations, which not only possess a common interest in the preservation of order and in the conservation of the maxims of international law, but also hold colonies and hence ought in a degree to consider the question which is now being agitated in Spain as their own problem?

The Spanish ambassador expressed the hope that England would not fail to perform the duties arising from her close alliance with Spain; and that she would not respond favorably to attempts by the United States to secure common action between the two Anglo-Saxon nations in regard to the Spanish colonies.[50] On May 27 Onis sent to Castlereagh the manifesto expounding Spain's policy in regard to Spanish America.[51] At the instance of his court, he again animadverted upon the attitude of the United States towards the independence of the Spanish colonies:

> Forgetting in regard to Spain every principle of legality and good faith, the government of the United States is disposed to recognize the dissident provinces. But in the same state paper which announces its intention, it declares what are its principles in this transaction. In reality, this declaration affects all the powers of Europe, particularly England.
>
> A government which casts aside the classic principles upon which the legitimacy of nations and the integrity of empires are founded; a

[50] Onis to Castlereagh, May 7, 1822, Public Record Office, Foreign Office Correspondence, Spain, 262.

[51] The note of Onis to Castlereagh, May 27, 1822, bears this endorsement, "Chevr. de Onis, May 27, 1822. Enclosing a Manifesto notifying that Spain is on the point of deputing commissioners to South America to treat with the Insurgent provinces", *ibid.*

government which seems to demand as a justification for *the right of recognition* only the simple and material existence of *fact*; a government which hardly learns of the revolution of New Spain . . . before it believes that there is established a solid and stable state whose legitimacy it should hasten to recognize; in fine, a government which, departing from the policy followed by other nations, not only works without their concurrence, but emphatically declares that its peculiar position encourages it to work in isolation without considering its international relations or awaiting the decision of other powers which have solicited it in vain, is not and cannot be a government that should influence by example the policy of other nations. Otherwise, a great truth would be unveiled to its eyes: there would appear in the future an *American* interest absolutely divergent from the *European* interest —an interest which would begin to ignore openly the principles of public law and even certain rules of convenience and decorum which have hitherto been respected by all civilized nations.[52]

This communication was followed by conferences between Castlereagh and Onis in which the Spaniard protested against any action by England which might favor the recognition of the independence of Spanish America.[53] Finally, on June 28, Castlereagh made a formal statement of his views: he assured Onis that England's "solicitude" for an amicable adjustment of the differences which existed between Spain and her colonies was "unabated" although her hopes of such an auspicious result had been "diminished" by the events which had happened from 1810 to 1822. Castlereagh declared that the king of England had learned with "satisfaction" that Ferdinand VII. had resolved to initiate negotiations with the revolted colonies upon a new basis.

H. Cath. My. may rest assured that, whilst these measures are in progress, the king his master will abstain, as far as possible, from any step which might prejudice H. Cath. M's endeavors for the termination of His differences with the said Provinces; but H. Brit. My. would not act with the candour and explicit friendship which He owes to His Ally the king of Spain, were He not, under present circumstances, to warn Him of the rapid progress of Events and of the danger of delay. H. Cath. My. must be aware that so large a portion of the world cannot, without fundamentally disturbing the intercourse of civilized Society, long continue without some recognized and established relations: That the State which can neither by It's Councils nor by It's arms, effectually assert It's own rights over It's dependencies so as to enforce obedience, and thus to make Itself responsible for maintaining their relations with other Powers, must sooner or later be prepared to see those relations establish themselves from the overruling necessity of the case, under some other form.[54]

[52] Onis to Castlereagh, May 27, 1822, P. R. O., *ubi supra.*

[53] Castlereagh to Onis, June 28, 1822, *ibid.* This correspondence between Onis and Castlereagh is mentioned by Paullin and Paxson, *Guide to the Materials in London Archives for the History of the United States,* p. 172.

[54] Castlereagh to Onis, June 28, 1822, Public Record Office, Foreign Office Correspondence, Spain, 262.

To this significant note which intimated that, if the estrangement between Spain and her colonies continued, the recognition of the independence of these colonies by England would be inevitable, the ambassador of Spain made no response.[55] It is evident that upon Castlereagh, as later upon Canning,[56] the example of the United States was not without influence.

Some effects of the action of the United States in regard to the independence of the revolted Spanish colonies were apparent in the congress of the Allies at Verona. In a "memorandum on the necessity of some further recognition of the independence of the Spanish colonies" which was presented to this congress on November 24 by the Duke of Wellington, a reference was made to the action of the United States in recognizing the independence of the Spanish-American governments; and, after referring to Castlereagh's note to Onis of June 28, it was suggested that the depredations of pirates who lurked in the harbors of Spanish America would compel England "to some farther recognition of the existence *de facto* of some one or more of these self-erected governments".[57] In general, the replies which were made by the Allies announced their adherence to policies already announced. On behalf of the Emperor Alexander, Count Nesselrode repeated the sentiments of his note to Argaiz of June 25, and declared that Russia would take no action which would prejudge the question of the independence of Spanish America.[58] Prince Metternich avowed Austria's intention not to recognize the *de facto* governments until Spain had voluntarily and formally renounced her sovereignty over the revolted American colonies.[59] Prussia expressed her dislike for governments which were based upon revolutions and averred that a civil war and the resolutions of the Allies were preparing a crisis in Spanish affairs which might terminate the struggle between Spain and her revolted American provinces.[60] While referring with approval to the views presented by England, France expressed a desire for the pacification of

[55] *Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda of Field Marshal Arthur Duke of Wellington (in continuation of the former series)*, I. 387.

[56] Stapleton, *Some Official Correspondence of George Canning*, I. 51. Comment upon the policy of the United States towards Spanish America was made in the *Courier*, April 9, 1822; and in the *Times*, April 10, 1822.

[57] *Despatches of Wellington (in continuation of the former series)*, I. 386–388.

[58] Villanueva, *La Monarquía en América: Fernando VII. y los Nuevos Estados*, pp. 172, 173, citing the French archives; *Oeuvres Complètes de Châteaubriand*, XII. 45.

[59] Villanueva, *La Monarquía en América: Fernando VII. y los Nuevos Estados*, p. 171; *Oeuvres Complètes de Châteaubriand*, XII. 45. See also *Tagebucher von Friedrich von Gentz*, III. 113.

[60] Villanueva, *La Monarquía en América*, pp. 173, 174; *Oeuvres Complètes de Châteaubriand*, XII. 45.

Spanish America; she suggested that the most desirable mode of solving the problem of the status of Spain's colonies would be a general measure by the Allies which would reconcile necessity with legitimacy.[61] Thus the problem of the recognition of the independence of the Spanish colonies that had been precipitated by the United States helped to widen the rift, which, because of the projected intervention in Spain,[62] had appeared between the Continental leaders of the Holy Alliance and England.

This study shows that the intention of the United States to recognize the independence of the revolted Spanish colonies was announced by the concerted action of the executive and Congress. As an entire family of new states was ultimately recognized, this action occupies a unique place in the annals of American diplomacy. In the light of subsequent history, the forecast of revolutionary tendencies in Spanish America which was made in Spain's manifesto protesting against the action of the United States seems prophetic; for the protracted revolution against Spain, 1810–1826, evidently fastened upon the Spanish-American people the habit of revolution. With regard to the relations between the New World and the Old, this paper reveals that in 1822 there was a difference of opinion between England and the Continental members of the Holy Alliance concerning the future status of the revolted Spanish colonies in America: England leaned towards the recognition of their independence; France wished to arrange a compromise between Spain and her colonies; while Austria, Prussia, and Russia wished to preserve Spain's dominions and sovereignty intact. The reactionary attitude of the motherland suggests that, even under the liberal constitution, there were some peninsular diplomats who wished to appeal to the Holy Alliance for the maintenance of Spain's suzerainty over her crumbling empire. It is obvious that, in the minds of certain Continental statesmen, Monroe's message of March 8, 1822, awoke a spirit of apprehension, or even of antagonism. Spanish statesmen, in particular, feared that, in regard to Spanish-American problems, the influence of the United States might ultimately counterbalance the influence of the Holy Alliance. The acknowledgment of the independence of the rising states of Spanish America in 1822, breathing defiance of the sacred doctrine of legitimacy, provoked a stronger protest from the chanceries of Continental Europe than the President's message to Congress of December 2, 1823, announcing the Monroe Doctrine.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON.

[61] *Oeuvres Complètes de Châteaubriand*, XII. 46, 47; Villanueva, *La Monarquía en América: Fernando VII. y los Nuevos Estados*, pp. 169–171.

[62] *Despatches of Wellington (in continuation of the former series)*, I. 555–559, 562–573, 611–615.

THE RUSSIAN FLEET AND THE CIVIL WAR

The coming of the Russian fleet to our shores in 1863 has been a topic of discussion for many years. A great deal of importance has been attached to this event both in the United States and in Russia. Curiously enough, in neither of the two countries is it generally recognized that this official visit was of any consequence to the other. In Russia it is regarded from the point of view of European politics, while in America many people associate it with the Civil War. Through the kindness of the Russian Minister of the Marine in permitting the writer to examine the official documents, and through timely articles on the subject in the *Morskoi Sbornik*, it is now possible to learn the real motives of the expedition.

It will be remembered that during the period of our Civil War Russia was having difficulties in Poland. The Poles were restless under the political conditions imposed upon them by Nicholas I. From Alexander II. they expected a change for the better, but when one year after another passed without any very marked improvement their discontent began to manifest itself in active opposition to the government. It first showed itself openly on February 25, 1861; and during the following two years it assumed such a formidable character that it became a matter of deep concern to the whole of Europe. Thinking that by seizing the most active participants in the insurrection the trouble could be made to die out, the Russian police, on the night of January 15, 1863, entered many homes in Warsaw and arrested the men with a view to putting them into the army. This act stirred the European powers and made the year 1863 an exceedingly critical one; for a time it looked as if it would lead to a general European war.

Prussia desired the friendship of Russia and the collapse of the uprising and therefore concluded, in February, 1863, a military convention binding the two nations to aid one another in putting down the revolt. France, England, Austria, and the other powers stood out against Russia and her treatment of the Poles. On April 17 the representatives of these governments addressed a note of remonstrance to Prince Gortchakov, the Russian minister of foreign affairs. This not having the desired effect they followed up the first note by a second in June and a third in August. This is not the place to enter into the diplomatic discussions that took place.

The point at issue, to put it briefly, was this. France, England, Austria, and the other powers argued that the Polish question was an international one, having been made such by the Congress of Vienna, and therefore that all those who signed the treaty of 1815 should have a voice in its settlement. Russia, on the other hand, insisted that the question was a purely domestic one and that no intervention would be acceptable. She would yield so far as to agree to consult the powers directly concerned, Austria and Prussia; but since Prussia was already on her side this concession was equivalent to a refusal. The point in dispute was clear and sharp and it could be decided in one of two ways: either by one or the other of the two contending parties backing out or by all fighting.

Russia expected to be called on to defend her cause by arms, at least she thought it was wise to prepare for whatever might come. On January 22, 1862,[1] the Grand Duke Constantine, general-admiral of the navy, instructed Popov, who was about to set out for Asia to take command of the Pacific squadron, that in case of war between Russia and a power stronger than Russia the weaker of his ships should be ordered to a safe harbor and that with those remaining he should destroy the enemy's commerce.[2] In June, 1863, war seemed inevitable, and General-Adjutant Krabbe, who directed the navy while the grand duke was at Warsaw, began to work on a plan of campaign. The fleet was very weak, even weaker than it appeared on paper. It was made up of a small squadron in the Pacific, seven war vessels of various descriptions at Cronstadt, and a frigate in the Mediterranean. They were all, or nearly all, of wood, and, although they had engines, the principal means of motion was still the sail, the orders being that steam should be resorted to only in case of urgent necessity. With these facts in mind, Krabbe submitted a report to the emperor on July 5, on the part which the navy might be made to play in the coming conflict. He pointed out that the history of naval warfare in general and the present American conflict in particular taught that a few war-ships, properly handled, could do a great deal of harm to the enemy. England, he said, avoided war with the United States because she knew how much her merchant marine would suffer from American cruisers. Russia's fleet was too weak to make an effective fight against the combined naval strength of England and France, but it was strong enough to prey upon their commerce. He went on to suggest that as soon as England realized what Russia had in mind

[1] Dates are according to new style.

[2] A.M.M.,D.K.M.M. (Arkhiv Morskogo Ministerstva, Dielo Kantseliarii Morskogo Ministerstva), no. 91, pt. I.

her attitude on the Polish question would change. If the fleet remained at home it would probably be blocked in; it was therefore necessary that it should be sent away to some place more conveniently situated for the purpose in mind. But this was a delicate operation. In order not to arouse England's suspicion the ships ought to leave singly, their apparent destination to be the Pacific or the Mediterranean. Even the officers should be kept in the dark as to the real motives until the very last minute. He concluded by saying that everything was to be gained from such a move and nothing to be lost. Supposing that the fleet failed in its purpose and in addition was destroyed, Russia's cause would not suffer, because, tied up at Cronstadt, it was both worthless and a care. If, however, the plan succeeded, much good would result.[3]

These arguments appealed to the emperor and he accepted Krabbe's propositions on July 7. Orders were at once given to put the ships in condition for foreign service and to provide them with money for two years. Rear-Admiral Unkovskii, a man of much naval experience, was offered the command of the Atlantic fleet, but, on his declining, the position was tendered to Captain Lisovskii, who was promoted to the rank of rear-admiral.

On July 26 Krabbe gave Lisovskii his instructions, which had received the approval of the emperor three days earlier. They were divided into fifteen points and were in substance as follows: "Your fleet is to consist of three frigates, three clippers, and two corvettes. In case of war destroy the enemy's commerce and attack his weakly defended possessions. Although you are primarily expected to operate in the Atlantic, yet you are at liberty to shift your activities to another part of the globe and divide your forces as you think best. After leaving the Gulf of Finland proceed directly to New York. It would be preferable to keep all the ships in that port, but if such an arrangement is inconvenient for the American government you may, with the advice of our representative in Washington, dispose of the vessels among the various Atlantic ports of the United States. When you learn that war has been declared it is left to you how to proceed, where to rendezvous, etc. Our minister will help you in the matter of supplies; he will have on hand a specially chartered boat to keep you informed of what is going on. Should you find out on the way that war has broken out begin operations at once. If soon after reaching New York you deem it wise to go to sea try to keep your fleet together until war is actually declared, but avoid the enemy, even commercial ships, so as

[3] *Ibid.*, no. 109, pt. I.

to cover your tracks. If through our minister or some other reliable source you are told of the opening of hostilities, dispose of your ships and plan your campaign as may seem best. Captain Kroun is preceding you to America to prepare for your coming. Study the Treaty of Paris so as to be well informed on matters of neutrality. Should you meet with Rear-Admiral Popov consult with him as to the course to be pursued. Communicate in cipher. Hand in person your secret instructions to the officers. Whether there is war or not make a study of the commercial routes, of the strength and weakness of the European colonies, of desirable coaling stations for our fleet, and of the economic and military importance of our own possessions. These instructions are made purposely general in order to give you a free hand to act according to your judgment and discretion."[4]

Towards the end of January, 1862, Popov left Europe for Hong Kong, arriving there in April. During that summer he sent his ships to different places in the Far East to observe the strength and weakness of the European colonies and also to give his men the necessary training. He himself sailed from Kamchatka on August 26, to visit Sitka, Esquimalt, and San Francisco, anchoring in the last-named place on September 28. On the return voyage he called at Honolulu and from there steered for Nagasaki, where his fleet was to rendezvous in November. During the winter other cruises were made, and with the experience and knowledge thus acquired he was in a position to know how to act when called upon.

He had not very long to wait.[5] On April 24 Krabbe wrote him of the critical situation in Europe and warned him to be ready at any moment to attack the enemy. Gregg, one of the officers of the admiralty, notified him on June 3 that the news of the declaration of war would be telegraphed to him to Omsk (end of the line), whence a courier would take it to Tientsin by way of Kiakhta and Peking. A boat should be ready at the mouth of the Pei-ho River to meet the courier. Seventeen days later Krabbe sent a despatch similar to the above, adding that he could not promise that the news would reach Popov before it reached the English admiral. On July 31 there followed a telegram, to the effect that affairs had reached a most acute stage and that he must keep in close touch with the Russian minister in Peking and not be far from Hong Kong or Shanghai where European news was to be had. Popov had, how-

[4] A. M. M., D. K. M. M., no. 109, pt. I.

[5] An interesting account of Popov is found in the *Morskoi Sbornik* of August and October, 1914. Popov was a very able officer and his reports, found in the archives, throw much light on conditions in the North Pacific.

ever, made up his mind how to act. The letter sent by Krabbe on April 24 had come to his hand on July 20. On the following day he replied that he was going to San Francisco, and ordered a collier to Kodiak Island, Alaska, which place he intended for one of his bases.[6]

About the middle of July orders were also telegraphed to the commander of the frigate *Osliabia,* at that time in Greek waters, to sail for America. On the way he was to stop in Portugal in order to learn of the state of affairs, to give out the destination as Siberia, to keep on the trade route between Liverpool and the West Indies; and he was told where to join the main body of the fleet, and how to proceed in case of war. About the same time Kroun departed for New York to explain the plan of campaign to M. Stoeckl, Russian minister in Washington, and to make ready for the coming of Lisovskii.

Since the cruise has nothing whatever to do with American affairs it is interesting to know why United States ports were selected for a base of operations. Aside from the friendly relations that had always existed between the two nations there were special reasons why they should draw close to each other at this critical period. Alexander had freed the serfs; Lincoln was emancipating the slaves. The United States had been invited by France to join the powers in dictating to Russia upon the Polish problem and had declined; Russia had been asked by France to intervene in the Civil War and had refused. Russia was fighting against insurrection; the United States to put down rebellion. The two governments had similar problems and the same European enemies and that was reason enough why they should feel kindly towards each other.

There were, however, other reasons why the fleet should come to America. In order to carry out Krabbe's plan the ships could not remain in Russia, and there was no other place in Europe where they would be received in friendliness. On the other hand, if anchored in one of the Atlantic ports of the United States, it would be possible to dash out quickly and in a short time be on the trade routes. This condition held true in the Pacific as well as in the Atlantic. Popov, who was not altogether bound as to his movements, decided to go to San Francisco for the following reasons. He had been there in 1859 and 1862 and had made many friends. If he should come again he was sure of a friendly reception. Every other available harbor in the Pacific, including those of Spanish America, was in the hands of the English, Dutch, Spaniards, Portuguese, or French, or under their influence. If he should enter a

[6] *Morskoi Sbornik,* October, 1914, pp. 35–40.

Chinese or Japanese port he would incur the danger of being blocked in by a superior force, for the enemy was certain to hear of the declaration of war two or three weeks before he did, because it had postal and telegraphic connections as far as Calcutta and fast boats from there to Shanghai. Of course he might wait in one of the Russian stations in the North Pacific, but these had neither postal nor telegraphic facilities, nor means for provisioning or repairing his ships, so that when he finally went to sea he would be greatly handicapped, and in place of seeking the enemy he would be looking for something to eat. Taking all these points into consideration, San Francisco seemed the most desirable port. The English and French, though numerous, were just then unpopular; the American population felt kindly towards the Russians, and their cruisers would be permitted to go and come as they pleased.[7]

When Lisovskii had received his orders he wrote to Captain Kroun to expect him in New York by September 1. Before entering the harbor he would send in one of his corvettes to learn of the state of affairs. If hostilities had not yet begun he would come in with all his force; if however the conflict was on, provisions should be sent to him to the island of Santa Catharina, Brazil, so as to reach there between November 1 and November 20. Supply ships should also be on hand by March 15, 1864, in Lobito Bay, Benguela, Western Africa, and by July 15 in San Matias Bay, Port San Antonio, Argentina.

Just before sailing Lisovskii called his officers together to acquaint them with the task before them. He decided that the first rendezvous should be in the Little Belt, and from there they would sail together, passing to the north of Great Britain, and try to reach New York before the war. If, however, after leaving the Belt a superior English and French force appeared and insisted on following, this would mean that it intended to attack as soon as war was announced. In that case Lisovskii was to signal, "separate on the first favorable occasion", and each ship was to take advantage of the fog or darkness to slip away and sail for New York. Should the opposing fleet act in an unfriendly manner, as by ordering the Russians back or in some such way, the admiral was to give the signal to attack. If in crossing the Atlantic it was learned that a state of war existed the plan of campaign was to be as follows. The *Alexander Nevskii* would operate on the route between Liverpool and South America, the *Peresviet* on the course taken by ships in going from England to the East Indies, the *Variag* was to look for commercial ships south of the equator, the *Vitiaz* between Cape

[7] A.M.M.,D.K.M.M., no. 91, pt. II., p. 410.

Hope and St. Helena Island, and the *Almaz* to capture every vessel of the enemy sailing between the equator and five degrees to the north. If war was declared by October 15 the rendezvous would be Santa Catharina Island.[8]

It was the original intention to put in commission seven warships, but on examination two were discovered to be unseaworthy and were left behind. Before going very far Lisovskii must have concluded that the remaining five were far from being in condition for hard service. The sails did not fit, the sea poured in through the port-holes, the food was poor, the sailors were inexperienced, never having undertaken such a long and hard voyage: all of which caused hardships, and scurvy broke out.[9] Finally on September 24 the flagship *Alexander Nevskii* and the *Peresviet* sailed into New York, followed in the course of the next two days by the *Variag* and the *Vitiaz,* and fifteen days later by the *Almaz.* The *Osliabia,* coming from the Mediterranean, had made this port about the middle of the same month.

The arrival of the fleet at New York came as a shock and surprise to London. Brunow, the Russian ambassador, who it seems was not advised of this piece of political strategy, became quite worried and convinced that this event would surely lead to war. He imparted his fears to Gortchakov, who began to question the wisdom of the whole thing and felt inclined to blame Krabbe. The latter stood his ground, and argued that England would not fight if her commerce would be endangered by so doing, and that a few Russian guns in the ocean would have more influence on England than a much larger number in Sevastopol.[10] Brunow and others were instructed to say, when questioned as to the purpose of the expedition, that the fleet was on its regular cruise to relieve other ships, and that until the European political situation was settled the ships would probably remain in the waters of the United States. It was for the European powers, particularly England, to draw whatever conclusions they pleased.

In their expectation to find a warm welcome in America the Russians were not disappointed. When Gideon Welles was officially notified of their coming he wrote to Stoeckl on September 23, expressing his pleasure at the news and placing at the service of the Russian admiral the Brooklyn Navy Yard and the other resources of the Navy Department. During the stay of the fleet in American waters deputations from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania,

[8] *Ibid.*, no. 109, pt. I., p. 87.
[9] *Morskoi Sbornik,* August, 1913, p. 43.
[10] A.M.M., D.K.M.M., no. 109, pt. II., p. 64.

Rhode Island, and other states came to pay their respects. Balls and banquets were given in honor of the officers, and the name of the emperor was cheered as the emancipator of the serfs and the friend of America. In their turn the Russians toasted the President and dwelt, as they were requested to do, on the historic friendship which bound Russia and America. All references to the European situation were purposely avoided. This was good diplomacy, for on the one hand it concealed the real purpose of the visit and on the other it strengthened the Americans in their belief that the fleet came especially for their benefit. The fact that this idea still has such a strong hold on our country shows how skillfully the game was played. It is only fair to say that this idea was not brought over on the fleet but was born on American soil. In their relations with the officers of England and France the Russians bore themselves in a friendly and correct manner. When the English and French ministers visited New York Lisovskii called on them, but only Lord Lyons returned the call."[11]

The festivities were not allowed to interfere with the main purpose of the visit. Stoeckl watched the political horizon and kept himself well informed of what was going on in Europe. About the middle of November it seemed as if a crisis had been reached and that war would surely follow. Lisovskii telegraphed for permission to go to the West Indies and there divide his forces for action. Krabbe replied, in December, advising him to remain where he was, and telling him that there was no danger of his being blocked in, because Stoeckl would warn him in plenty of time to make his escape.

Rear-Admiral Popov, with his squadron, consisting of the corvettes *Bogatir, Kalevala, Rinda,* and *Novik,* the clippers *Abrek* and *Gaidamak,* anchored in San Francisco harbor on October 12, and immediately put himself in touch with the legation in Washington. The officers and men were as warmly and as enthusiastically received on the Pacific as on the Atlantic. These courtesies and the hospitality were deeply appreciated by Popov and his men, and not in words only, for they expressed their gratitude in deeds. About three weeks after their arrival a big fire broke out in the city and the Russian officers and sailors rendered much valuable assistance in putting it out. For this service the city council passed resolutions of thanks which they framed and gave to Popov.[12] But the Russians were willing to do much more, not merely to help San Francisco but also to fight the battles of the nation, and if the proper

[11] A.M.M., D.K.M.M., no. 109, pt. II., pp. 72, 73, Stoeckl to Krabbe.
[12] *Ibid.*, no. 91, pt. III., p. 34.

opportunity had come they would have done so. During the winter of 1863–1864 San Francisco was without the protection of a man-of-war. It was reported that the Confederate cruisers *Sumter* and *Alabama* were planning to attack the city. In view of this possibility Popov took measures to prevent it. He gave orders to his officers that should such a corsair come into port, the ranking officer of the fleet should at once give the signal "to put on steam and clear for action". At the same time an officer should be despatched to the cruiser to hand to its commander the following note:

> According to instructions received from His Excellency Rear-Admiral Popov, commander in chief of His Imperial Russian Majesty's Pacific Squadron, the undersigned is directed to inform all whom it may concern, that the ships of the above mentioned squadron are bound to assist the authorities of every place where friendship is offered them, in all measures which may be deemed necessary by the local authorities, to repel any attempt against the security of the place.

If no attention were paid to this warning and the cruiser should open fire it should be ordered to leave the harbor, and in case of refusal it should be attacked.[13] Russia came very near becoming our active ally.

Copies of these orders were sent to Stoeckl and Krabbe, who forwarded them to Gortchakov. The replies and comments of these men bring out in the clearest possible light Russia's attitude towards the Civil War. In his letter of March 13 to Popov, Stoeckl expressed himself in this manner. As he understood St. Petersburg diplomacy, so far as Russia is concerned there is neither North nor South but a United States, and therefore Russia has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of another nation and consequently Popov should keep out of the conflict.

> From all the information to be obtained here [he goes on to say] it would seem that the Confederate cruisers aim to operate only in the open sea and it is not expected that cities will be attacked and San Francisco is in no danger. What the corsairs do in the open sea does not concern us; even if they fire on the forts, it is your duty to be strictly neutral. But in case the corsair passes the forts and threatens the city, you have then the right, in the name of humanity, and not for political reasons, to prevent this misfortune. It is to be hoped that the naval strength at your command will bring about the desired result and that you will not be obliged to use force and involve our government in a situation which it is trying to keep out of.[14]

Gortchakov thoroughly disapproved of Popov's plans and urged on him the strictest neutrality. He had foreseen the possibility of

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 102, 103.
[14] *Morskoi Sbornik*, October, 1914, p. 45.

such a situation. In a letter of January 27, 1862, addressed to Krabbe, he had pointed out that although Russia had not declared her neutrality in the war between the states, yet her status was exactly the same as if she had done so. Russia did not intend to support the North against the South and the naval officers should be warned on that point.[15] There was nothing secret or deceitful in this attitude. He had made his position clear to the American government more than once. In a conversation with Bayard Taylor, our chargé d'affaires, on September 27, 1862, he had said, "We desire above all things the maintenance of the American Union. We can not take any part more than we have done. We have no hostility to the southern people."[16] The American public can without difficulty appreciate his stand, especially in view of our own attitude towards the European struggle now going on.[17]

During the winter months the European war clouds passed away. Russia held firm and won. England was willing to call names but not to fight, and France was helpless without England. Gradually the insurrection was put down and the excitement subsided. Officers of the Russian navy assert that the coming of the fleet to America was, if not altogether, at least in a very great measure, responsible for England's change of front and consequently for the prevention of the war.[18] Before this conclusion can be accepted evidence from English sources will have to be produced. The claim may have more substance than appears on the surface; the diplomatic aspect of the question as well as the strategic importance of such an expedition needs more investigation. It is true that the Russian papers and many of the statesmen of that time attached a great deal of value to the visit. When the fleet returned to Cronstadt the emperor reviewed it, thanked the officers for their service, and promoted nearly all of them. One writer states that Alexander II. looked on this cruise as one of the greatest practical

[15] A.M.M., D.K.M.M., no. 91, pt. I.

[16] *Exec. Docs.*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., II. 840 (1863–1864).

[17] In 1864 or 1865 (the exact date is difficult to determine from the document) while the Russian clipper *Izumrud* was anchored at Brest there was a report that the *Shenandoah* planned to attack a merchantman of one of the northern states. In view of this the commander of the clipper asked for instructions from the Russian minister at Paris as to what to do under the circumstances. In reply he was advised to avoid trouble with the *Shenandoah*, but "if in the presence of our ship the *Shenandoah* attacks any vessel of the North American States the commander of the *Izumrud* should render the latter every assistance [obiazuetsia okazat posliednomu vsiakoe sodieistvie] and make a report of the affair to our representative at Washington." See A.M.M., D.K.M.M., no. 106, p. 218.

[18] See article on this subject in *Voennaia Entsiklopediia*, vol. II. Also the writers in the *Morskoi Sbornik*, noted above, and the quotations which they give.

achievements in the history of the Russian navy and one of the noteworthy pages in the history of his reign.[19]

No one can question for a moment that this visit gave much moral support to the cause of the Union. At a time when European powers were plotting against us, when conditions at home were most discouraging, we felt that we had a friend in Russia. It put life and strength into the people of the North. Every one took the visit as a special mark of friendship and it was highly appreciated. Writing to Bayard Taylor on December 23, 1863, Seward says: "In regard to Russia, the case is a plain one. She has our friendship, in every case, in preference to any other European power, simply because she always wishes us well, and leaves us to conduct our affairs as we think best."[20] Its general effect on the whole nation is excellently stated by Rhodes:[21]

> The friendly welcome of a Russian fleet of war vessels, which arrived in New York City in September; the enthusiastic reception by the people of the admiral and officers when offered the hospitalities of the city; the banquet given at the Astor House by the merchants and business men in their honor; the marked attention shown them by the Secretary of State on their visit to Washington "to reflect the cordiality and friendship which the nation cherishes towards Russia": all these manifestations of gratitude to the one great power of Europe which had openly and persistently been our friend, added another element to the cheerfulness which prevailed in the closing months of 1863.

On April 26, 1864, Gortchakov told Krabbe that the emperor said there was no longer any need for the fleet to remain in America. Lisovskii was notified the next day to get ready to return home. Somewhat similar orders were despatched to San Francisco.

In the course of their stay in American waters the officers visited many cities and were everywhere entertained with pleasure. Before departing from our shores the Russians gave a reception at Washington to which were invited members of the Cabinet, Congress, and many other leading men of the country. It was a brilliant affair and one of the social events of the season. This brought to an end a unique and interesting episode in Russo-American diplomatic relations.

It is, of course, true that the fleet was not ordered to America for our benefit, but this should not blind us to the fact that we did profit by the event as if this had been the case. If, as the Russians maintain, the presence of their ships in our waters saved them from

19 *Voennaia Entsiklopediia*, vol. II.

20 *Exec. Docs.*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., II. 851 (1863–1864).

21 Rhodes, *History of the United States*, IV. 418.

a struggle in which they were not in a position to engage, we should be very proud that it was in our power to do so. It was a most extraordinary situation: Russia had not in mind to help us but did render us distinct service; the United States was not conscious that it was contributing in any way to Russia's welfare and yet seems to have saved her from humiliation and perhaps war. There is probably nothing to compare with it in diplomatic history.

F. A. Golder.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

How the Middle Ages got their Name

In my study "Anent the Middle Ages" (American Historical Review, XVIII. 710–726, 1913) I pointed out that the oft-made ascription of the idea of a Middle Age to the Italian Humanists lacked as yet demonstration, and that the earliest use of that term thus far discovered by the students of historical periodization carries us back only to the German text-book writer Cellarius (Keller) in 1685, or at farthest to a sporadic utterance of the Liège scholar Rausin in 1639. But in the last months a more systematic research has brought notable revision of this result. Professor Paul Lehmann of Munich, assuming the editorship of the *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* founded by Ludwig Traube, opens the first issue (1914) of its new fifth volume with an historical sketch "Vom Mittelalter und von der Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters". In this study (brought to my attention by my colleague Hamilton) he shows the phrase *medium aevum* in use by the German jurist-historian Goldast as early as 1604, while the synonymous phrase *media aetas* was used almost a century earlier (1518) by the Swiss scholar Vadian (Joachim von Watt), whose Basel neighbors Beatus Rhenanus and the publisher Heerwagen were at about the same time expressing the same idea by *media antiquitas* and *media tempora.* Nay, this last locution or one close akin to it, *media tempestas,* Lehmann has detected a half-century earlier, in 1469, and indeed in the mouth of an Italian Humanist. In the edition of Apuleius brought out that year at Rome is a letter of Giovanni Andrea (de' Bossi ?), bishop of Aleria and later librarian of the Vatican, who, paying a warm tribute to his German friend Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa (d. 1464), declares him to have been familiar with all histories, not only the ancient, "sed mediae tempestatis tum veteres tum recentiores usque ad nostra tempora". The "to our times" suggests that to the bishop his *media tempestas* meant the whole period intervening since the ancients and had no hither terminus; but his distinction between "the older" and "the more recent" betrays his consciousness of a transition, and his equivocal phrase, borrowed by later notices of Nicholas, as by Hartmann Schedel in the Nuremberg Chronicle (1493) and by Lefèvre of Étaples in his standard edition (1514)

of the works of the Cusan, may not impossibly be the parent of the later use. But it is clear from the variants that we have to do with the history of an idea, not of a phrase; and even Lehmann's careful research makes no claim to exhaustiveness.

To the English-speaking student it is of interest to note that our use of a plural finds an early precedent in *media tempora,* and that so early as 1611 (Lehmann says 1612, but the edition of 1612 was a reprint) the learned Bodleian librarian, Thomas James, in his *Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture,* was using the adjective "middle aged". Already Vadian had coined the German *mittel-jährig.*

George L. Burr.

DOCUMENTS

1. *Observations of Superintendent John Stuart and Governor James Grant of East Florida on the Proposed Plan of 1764 for the Future Management of Indian Affairs.*

The problem of Indian management in America became an increasingly important one after the opening of the French and Indian War. The tendency subsequent to this time was to transfer the control of Indian affairs from the colonies to the central government. The first important step in this direction was taken in 1755, when the government took over the political control of the Indians and appointed two superintendents to have charge of the different nations. The next step, taken in 1761, was to take the purchase of Indian lands out of the hands of the colonies and place it under the control of the home government. When the issue of the war was known, a still more important step was taken respecting the Indian trade and its concomitant, the fur-trade, with the announcement of the king's proclamation in October following the treaty of cession.[1] The main provisions of the proclamation are too well known to be restated in this connection. Attention may be redirected, however, to one or two clauses. In addition to reserving for the present the unorganized territory between the Alleghany Mountains and the Mississippi River for the use of the Indians, the government guaranteed the Indians in the possession of these lands by announcing in the proclamation that no governor or commander-in-chief would be allowed to make land grants within this territory, and further prohibited "for the present" all land purchases and settlements within this territory. Trade within this reservation was, however, made free to all who would obtain a license from the governor or commander-in-chief of the colony in which they resided.

The proclamation provided, moreover, for the later publication of rules for the control of the Indian trade. The Board of Trade delayed action in the matter, however, until late in the spring of 1764, at which time men familiar with the Indian trade were consulted. Probably the greatest influence came from Sir William Johnson, whose agent, George Croghan, was present in London for the purpose of laying before the board his superior's opinion. The

[1] Shortt and Doughty, *Documents relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1759–1791* (Canadian Archives, Ottawa, 1907), 119–123.

most important reform desired by Johnson was the creation of a department independent of the military and with an adequate number of employees to supervise efficiently the Indian traders. The plan as suggested by the board, under the direction of Hillsborough, embodies most of Johnson's ideas. According to the proposed scheme[2] British North America was to be divided into two districts, each under the control of a general superintendent or agent appointed by the crown. The Ohio River was designated as the approximate line of division. In these two districts the regulation of such Indian affairs as treaties, land purchases, questions of peace and war, and trade relations was to be entrusted to the superintendents, who were to be entirely free from outside interference. Without the superintendent's consent no civil or military officer could interfere with the trade or other affairs of any of the Indian tribes. The Indian trade was to be under the direct supervision of the general superintendent. Traders who desired to go among the Indians to ply their trade could do so by obtaining a license from the province from which they came. The region into which the traders intended to go was to be clearly defined in the license and each had to give bond for the observance of the laws respecting the trade. Provision was made for the determining of the value of all goods, and traders were forbidden to charge more than the price fixed. For the still better regulation of the trade, it was to be centred, in the northern district, about the regularly fortified and garrisoned posts, and in the southern, in the towns of the several tribes.

Such, in brief outline, are some of the main provisions of the plan. On account of the proposal to raise a tax from the fur-trade for the support of the establishment it would have been necessary for Parliament to act upon this plan. Such action, however, was never taken. The Stamp Act disturbances made such a proposal inexpedient. The superintendents of Indian affairs were instructed, nevertheless, to put the plan into operation as far as possible.[3] John Stuart of the Southern Department immediately did this, but Johnson delayed till 1766. It was soon apparent that the cost of this establishment would be enormous; hence proposals were made to change the organization. The change was finally made in 1768 by placing the control of the trade in the hands of the colonies.[4]

[2] *New York Colonial Documents*, VII. 637; Shortt and Doughty, *Constitutional Documents*, p. 433; Alvord and Carter, *Illinois Historical Collections*, X. 273.

[3] "Representation of the Lords of Trade on the State of Indian Affairs", March 17, 1768, *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, VIII. 24.

[4] Hillsborough to Johnson, April 15, 1768, *ibid.*, VIII. 57, 58.

Before hope that the plan might be put into complete operation was abandoned, however, it was submitted to various persons for their opinion, particularly to the two general superintendents, to the governors of colonies immediately concerned, and to such other officials as, on account of their positions, might be expected to offer suggestive criticisms. There are available, at present, the criticisms of Sir William Johnson,[5] superintendent for the Northern Department, John Stuart, superintendent for the Southern Department, Benjamin Franklin,[6] Richard Jackson,[7] who was secretary for Grenville in 1763 and afterwards closely associated with Shelburne when he was Secretary of State for the Southern Department, Colonel John Bradstreet,[8] Lieut.-Gov. Colden of New York,[9] Governor James Grant of East Florida, Governor George Johnstone of West Florida, and an unnamed author.[10] The two published herewith, Stuart's and Grant's, have not hitherto been printed. They will doubtless be suggestive to students interested in the history of imperial administration in the southern colonies subsequent to 1763.

CLARENCE E. CARTER.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS HUMBLY SUBMITTED TO THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS OF TRADE AND PLANTATIONS.[11]

Article 1st

PANZACOLA 1st December 1764

The first and main step towards the right Governing of Indians and bringing them under some Police will be having Good men Traders in the different Nations subjected to good and wholesome regulations; this can hardly be effected while each Governor of the several Provinces can grant a Licence to any person to Trade indiscriminatly to all the Indian Nations; General Licences are now granted to particular people, which extend to all the Towns in every Nation within this Department, by Virtue of which they permitt their Substitutes to Trade wherever they pleased I have seen such a permitt from a Trader Licenced in South Carolina which concludes ("Given at my Office in Augusta") this keeps up that Competition and Jealousy between the provinces or the Trading people in the Different provinces, which I always considered as incompatable with good Order and Government among Indians, to

[5] *Ibid.*, VII. 661–666.

[6] *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (Smyth ed.), IV. 467–471.

[7] Lansdowne MSS., LVII. 84. This is being printed in the *Illinois Historical Collections*, vol. XI.

[8] *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, VII. 690–694.

[9] *Ibid.*, VII. 667–670.

[10] Long letter of Johnstone, January 2, 1765, in P. R. O., C. O. 323: 20. The anonymous paper is in Lansdowne MSS., LVII. 84.

[11] P. R. O., C. O. 323: 19, 20. Indorsed "Observations by John Stuart Esqr. His Majesty's Superintendant, on the Plan for the future Management of Indian Affairs. In Mr Stuart's Letter of 8 Decr 1764. Read."

this must be attributed, the late Messages which I have received from the Creek Nation prohibiting all Trade from or communication with this Province, at the same time expressing such partiality in favour of the *Old Path* (meaning the Road by which the Traders go from Georgia into that Nation,)[12] and refusing to permitt our Settling Any Lands to the East ward of Mobile Bay.[13] The Quantity of Peltry and Furrs now purchased from and the Consumption of British Commodities by the Indians in this District, will not be enlarged, by a greater Number of Traders, they are Now at their Utmost Extent, so that the Interest of the Nation cannot be affected by confining the Trade to a limited Number of good Men, the whole Quantity of Deer skins Extracted Annually from all the Nations in this District does not exceed Eight Hundred Thousand pounds, half dressed, which at 2 shillings p lb. is Eighty Thousands Pounds Stirling, the leaving of which open to all His Majesty's Subjects, I humbly Conceive not to be an Object worth pursuing at the expence of Good Order and regularity among the Indians.[14]

Article 2d

I apprehend the Illinouis Indians will more properly belong to this District than the Northern, as the facility of Water Carriage upon the Mississippi will Naturally connect that Country with this Province from whence it will of Course be Supplied with Goods and Traders who must give bond and be responsible for their Conduct, here; the Country of the Illinois is about 1200 miles by Land from Pitsburg and about seven hundred Miles from Detroit, so that their Supplies from the Northern provinces by these places, would be extreamly precarious and attended with very great Charges; the Traders and persons concerned in the Management of Indian Affairs would be too remote from the principal Jurisdiction, if that Country be Annexed to the Northern Department; the Distance from this place to Illinois by Land is Three Hundred and Fifty French Leagues, which an Indian Courier will perform in Twenty Days, and the Voyage from thence Down the River is often performed in twelve and fourteen days, so that Intelligence may be received from and Orders sent to that Country from this Province Much sooner than could possibly be effected from Any part of the Northern district.[15]

[12] In a talk by the Mortar to John Stuart, July 22, 1764, occurs the following observation in connection with the relations of the Creeks to the new province of West Florida. He "desires that his Nation may be supplyed with Goods from Augusta as they have been for many Years, and that he will not suffer any Horses with Goods either from Panzacola or Mobile to come to his Nation". Journal of Proceedings by John Stuart, November 1 to December 1, 1764. P. R. O., C. O. 323: 23.

[13] In the following summer, however, at the congress held at Pensacola the Creeks ceded virtually all the territory lying between the bays of Pensacola and Mobile. See text of treaty in *Mississippi Provincial Archives*, I. 213. For discussion see P. J. Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, p. 244 *et seq.*

[14] For similar statements see Barrington's plan for the West, May 10, 1766, Lansdowne MSS., L. 45; Gage to Taylor, August 11, 1766, Canadian Archives, B. 2–2: 114; Governor Wright to Shelburne, November 29, 1766, Lansdowne MSS., LIII. 203.

[15] Sir William Johnson favored the inclusion of the Illinois Indians in the Northern Department. *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, VII. 661.

The last Post belonging to the French in the Department of Louisiana was that of Vincenne on the Oubache it is 155 Leagues by Water and six days Journey by Land from Illinois, this post is Sixty, french Leagues below the Towns of the Yaughtanous,[16] and about 120 Leagues from the Miamis on the same River, those Nations were always supplied from the Illinois, this I mention that Your Lordships may with Greater propriety determine what Department they shall belong to; I am of Opinion that the Departments and the jurisdiction of the Superintendants will be better distinguished by exact Lists of the Nations or Tribes that shall be judged to belong to them, than by any Line or Boundary but if Your Lordships shall Judge a precise fixed boundary Necessary I think it may be very distinctly ascertained, by the Degree of Latitude.

Article 3d

I humbly propose that the Traders for the small Nations on the Mississippi and the Lakes, be fixed at Point Iberville, if that River can be rendered Navigable, in which Event, a Post will be established there.

Article 7th

One sett of Officers will be Sufficient for the Small Nations on the Lakes Pontchartrain, Maurepas and the Eastern Bank of the Mississippi, who I humbly propose shall reside at Point Iberville where it is proposed to established a Post; One sett of Officers for the Chactaw Nation, to reside at Tombeckby,[17] where there are very good Accommodations; one Sett in the Chickasaw Nation, and one Sett to reside at Fort De Chartres, in the Illinois Nation; as the Upper and Lower Creeks consider them Selves in Many respects as different people and live at a Distance from each Other, I am of Opinion that two Setts of Officers will be Necessary, one to reside at Fort Apalache[18] the other at the Albama Fort,[19] Two setts of Officers will likewise be necessary for the Cherokee Nation, the Lower and Over-Hill Settlements of which are 160 Miles distant, the Officers for the Upper Cherokees to reside at Chotee,[20] those for the lower at Fort Prince George;[21] as the Catawbas, Lower Chickasaws Near Augusta Tuscaroas in North Carolina Notteways and Samponys in Virginia live among our Settlements and are immediately under the Eye of Government the Expence of Officers for

[16] Ouiatanons. Other variants are Wea, Wee, Wawaughtanneys, Wawetannes, etc. The town of Ouiatanon (on the site of the present city of Lafayette, Indiana), is sometimes referred to as Weaugh Town. Consult the Bureau of American Ethnology's *Handbook of American Indians,* II. 174, 925; Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail,* II., index.

[17] Near the junction of the Black Warrior and the Tombigbee rivers, in Sumter County, Ala.

[18] At or near St. Marks, Florida, near Apalachee Bay.

[19] Built by the French in 1715 and called by them Fort Toulouse. It stood just above the junction of the Coosa and the Tallapoosa rivers near the site of Montgomery, Ala.

[20] Great Echota (or Chota), the ancient capital and "peace town" of the Cherokees, was on the south side of Little Tennessee River, in Monroe County, Tenn.

[21] On the northern fork of the Keowee River, in Pickens County, S. C.

them well may be Saved, except an Armourer for the Catawbas and One for the Tuscororas.

Article 9th

As in this Extensive Department both Superintendant's deputies may be Necessarily employed when the Office of Commissary in any one of the Districts may become Vacant by Death, Suspension or Resignation, I humbly propose that the Superintendant may, in any such Case, have the power of appointing a Commissary untill His Majesty's pleasure be known.

Article 10th

I humbly propose to Your Lordships that no provincial Agent shall be sent into the Indian Nations from any of the Provinces, but that all Talks and Transactions of a public Nature, shall be transmitted to the Indians by the Commissaries residing in their respective Nations.

Article 24th

In observing upon Article first I submitted to Your Lordships such inconveniencies as arise from the Different Governors being impowered to grant Licences to any and every person to Trade in all the Nations without Reserve or Restriction, when South Carolina was the Frontier Province, that Government very properly took the Lead in all Indian Affairs without Competition, but now the Colonies of Georgia, East and West Florida intervene and by their Situation have More immediate Intercourse with the Chactaws, Creeks, Chickasaws and the Nations on the Mississippi from which South Carolina is so remote, that she can have little or no Connection with them except what may arise by sending their Traders seven or eight Hundred Miles; I would therefore humbly propose to Your Lordships that instead of this general and Unlimited Manner of Licenceing Traders to the Indian Nations, some other be adopted by which the Competition and Confusion arising from Crowds of Traders and Packhorsemen being Sent indiscriminately from the different Provinces May be avoided. I beg leave to submitt the following proposals, First that the Power of granting Licences be vested in the Superintendant; that a certain limited Number of Traders be licenced, giving security as in Article 25th, That one Trader be allowed to every Hundred and fifty Gun-Men in each Nation except the Chactaws, who from the inability of the French to send Traders among them, and of Course the Small Demand for their Deer skins before the Cession of this Country as well as the Very limited Extent of their Hunting Ground, are become indolent and very bad Hunters; of these I would propose that one Trader should be allowed Two Hundred Gun-Men, I also propose that each Trader be Licenced for a particular District, where he Must reside and Trade; but should it appear to Your Lordships improper to vest the Superintendant with Power from a possibility of his being partial or using it to self-Interested purposes, then I propose that a person Not concerned in Indian Trade shall be deputed from each of the Councils of the four Southern Provinces in this District to meet the Superintendant at Saint Augustine at certain fixed times, once in One, Two or Three Years as shall be judged proper to form a Board for renewing and granting Licences in the Manner above Mentioned and Under the regulations in this plan,

at which Meeting the Superintendant shall preside and in Case of an equal division his Voice to be decisive; And in Case of the Death of any Trader, the Superintendant shall have power to Licence some other person in his room, which Licence shall be Valid and Effectual, till the meeting of the Board for Granting and renewing Licences as above proposed, and I beg leave farther to propose to your Lordships, that the Superintendant may be impowered to take away the Licence of any Trader who shall Misbehave and not conform to such regulations as shall be by Your Lordships judged Necessary.[22]

Article 33d

I do not consider the regulation of Trade to Indian Nations in this Department, as the principal object of this plan, but as a Necessary Step towards the proper Government of Indians,[23] for as I have already observed the Extraction of Furrs and peltry from and the Consumption of British Manufactures by these Nations are at their Utmost extent, and will not be increased or diminished by the Mode of carrying on the Trade; If therefore it shall be determined, to limit the Traders to the Indian Nations as above Mentioned, a Tariff for carrying on the Trade appears to me to be the Next Necessary Step: all the Different Nations of Indians in this Department have constantly Fixed and determined the Value of European Commodities by pounds of Deer Skins, either half dressed or in the Hair; this they found Necessary to prevent Disputes, which otherwise would have been endless; I propose that the Tariff be settled at a Congress with each of the different Nations, at which all the Traders to such Nation shall be present, and that it shall be with the Mutual consent of both Parties, which will remove the least appearance of injustice on either Side; I shall endeaver to regulate the prices so as to encourage good people to venture themselves and their properties amongst the Indians, while proper care shall be taken that the Indians are not imposed upon or any Unreasonable Advantage taken of their Necessities; if the Traders are allowed to under-sell each other it will create great Jealousy and Discontent among the Indians who will constantly think themselves imposed upon, it will like-wise in time so reduce the prices of our Commodities, that none but the Lowest Class of people will be encouraged to go into the Nations for a bare Sustinance;

[22] The article thus criticized is as follows: "That all persons intending to trade with the Indians, shall take out Licenses for that purpose, under the hand or seal of the Governor or Commander in Chief of the Colony from which they intend to carry on such Trade, for every of which Licenses, no more shall be demanded or taken than two Shillings." *Op. cit.* Richard Jackson observed concerning this article: "I have an objection of a singular kind to the Prohibition of Trade to be carried on without a License from a Governor. The fee is certainly easy, but ways will infallibly be found to introduce the Practice of making a Present, and to make it worth an Indian Traders while not to hesitate about the giving it, if practices of this sort have prevailed too much in England, they cannot but be justly feared at so great a Distance from the Eye of Government". Lansdowne MSS., LVII. 84. Sir William Johnson's view of this provision was likewise adverse. *Op. cit.*, p. 664.

[23] This does not appear to have been the view held by the successive ministries and by the various groups in the ministries during this period. For discussion of this point see Carter, *Great Britain and the Illinois Country, 1763–1774*, chapter V.

as such Men are generally inferiour to the Indians in their Understanding and Much more depraved in their Morals, the Indians Naturally judging of all White-People from those with whom they Must daily Converse, will soon regard us with the greatest contempt and Hatred, this really was the Case in the Cherokee Nation, where, by a Mistaken Policy of the Government of South-Carolina, the prices of Goods were So reduced, that For many Years there has not been a Trader in that Nation but was Bankrupt; which hindered the Indians from being well supplied; whilst they were every day Cheated and abused by the wretched Traders, and to this principally was owing that discontent and Disorder which Ended in an open War with that Nation.[24]

Article 43rd

If the Traders to the Indian Nations can be Limited and a Tariff established in the Manner which I have submitted to Your Lordships, I think Deer-Skins and furrs exported from this Department will bear a Duty, to be received by the Collectors of His Majesty's Customs at the Different ports of Entry, where such skins shall be shipped for Europe.

Civil Government has but very lately taken place here[25] and His Majesties Troops have not as Yet taken possession of the Illinois, nor have we any Traders to that Country and the small Nations of Indians on the Mississippi, so that it is impossible to ascertain the Quantity of Furrs and Peltry that may be exported from hence; I have in General estimated the Value in all this Department to be near £80,000 Sterling, from which a Duty of 10 p Ct. will produce £8000 Sterling; I do not know what quantity of Beaver and Furrs may be Exported by our Traders in the New-Ceded Countries, but the French carried on a very extensive Trade from the Illinois, up the Messourie and to the Nations to the Westward of the Mississippi; As the Spaniards are now daily expected to take possession of French Louisiana, and as their regulations of Commerce to their American Countries extreamly Vigorous, it is very propable that a Strict Execution of them may prove an Obstacle to their supplying the Indians properly; and that in such Case the Nations on the Missourie and to the Westward of the Mississippi may bring their skins and furrs to Barter at the Illinois and other English posts; I am not sufficiently acquainted with the Trade in the Northern Department to form any Estimate of its amount or what Duty it will bear, but if Your Lordships find upon Examination that the Trade will bear the Expence of the Indian Establishment, I humbly propose, that all Duties and imposts on peltry and furrs by provincial Laws be taken off; If the regulations proposed by your Lordships take place; I beg leave to lay before You the following Calculation of Expences, for Officers on the Indian Establishment in which I consider that they

[24] Such a tariff as suggested here was put into operation by Stuart. A copy of the tariff is attached to Stuart's "Regulations for the better carrying on of the Trade with the Indian Tribes in the Southern District", enclosed in a letter of Stuart to the Board of Trade, July 28, 1767. P. R. O., C. O. 323: 25, 26.

[25] George Johnstone, who had been commissioned governor of West Florida, did not arrive at Pensacola, the capital of the province, till October 21, 1764. Johnstone to Halifax, October 31, 1764, *Mississippi Provincial Archives*, I. 152. In the interval the province had been governed by the military.

are not to be concerned in Trade and that their Sallaries are to be their Sole Dependance as well as their inducement to live in the Indian Countries.

Calculations of Expences attending the Indian Establishment in the Southern Department.

For the Illinois if it shall belong to this Department.

A Deputy p Ann	£200..—	
Clerk	50..—	
Interpreter	50..	
Armourer	36..	
		£336..—..

Iberville

Commissary for the small Nations	£150..—..—	
Clerk	50..—..—	
Interpreter	50..—..—	
Armourer	36..—..—	
		286..—..

Chacktaws. Officers as above	286..—..—
Chickasaws	286..—..—
Upper Creeks	286..—..—
Lower Creeks	286..—..—
Upper Cherokees	286..—..—
Lower Cherokees	286..—..—
The Catabas. An Armourer	36..—..—
The Tusaroras—Ditto	36..—..—
Two Deputy Agents @ £200 p Annum each	400..—..
Two Clerks for Ditto @ £50 ....each	100..—..
Stationary and Expences of office £50 ....each	100..——..
	3010..——

Superintendant @ .....p Ann:
Secretary for Indian Affairs .....p Ann:
Two Clerks .....p Ann:
Present Provisions and Other Contingent Expenses £

The Expence of the Officers upon the Indian Establishment, the Superintendant etc:, can be easily ascertained by Your Lordships, but the Expence of the Necessary presents Annually to the Chiefs of the Different Nations, and the provisions for them at the different Posts, as well as the Many other Contingencies in the Department will for some time be considerable and cannot at this time be easily ascertained; the French annual presents in European Commodities to the Chactaw Nation Amounted to near £4000 Sterling besides provisions and small Gratifications to all visiting parties and at their Annual general Meetings at which no less than four thousand souls were commonly present, and where all the Chiefs were entertained at a great Expence; a too sudden alteration of this Conduct will certainly be attended with much danger, the Indians are descerning, and know the weak State of the New Colonies, and how incapable they are even to support a Defensive war with them, which will always be favourable to the Indians and distructive to us.

The Spaniards are hourly Expected to take possession of New Orleans, with 4000 regulars, they may attempt to seduce the Indians on our side of the Mississippi, and from the Measures pursuing by them and the Governor of New Orleans, their doing so is greatly to be Suspected and guarded against; for the person appointed second in Command in Louisiana, is a French-Man Mr. Villemont who was for Many Years an Officer in this Country and remarkable for his address in the Management of Indians and the principal French Interpreters and people Most acquainted with the Chactaws and other Nations are said to be retained by Mr Dabbadie for them; a Number of the Most leading Chiefs of the Chactaw Nation with their followers are now at New Orleans upon invitation, all which Evinces the Necessity of continuing to Treat the Indians upon the French Plan, till they can be Made Sensible of the benefit arising from a British Government and a plentiful and well regulated Trade; it is probable the greatest Efforts of the Spaniards to attach the Indians to their Interest, will be made on their first arrival, in which if they fail, there will not be much to be apprehended from their future attempts, altho' the Difficulty and Expence in Managing the Indians will be greatly encreased by the least Competition for their friendship.

The whole Expence for annual presents to the Chiefs in the Different Nations, Provisions, the Consumption of which by the Indians at the Different Posts is very Considerable, small Gratifications on particular Occasions, Expresses, Carryage, Occasional Deputies and Commissaries of Presents and provisions, Interpreters, and Leaders of parties, with many other unforseen Contingencies, with the greatest Oconomy cannot Amount to much Less than £11000 sterling P Annum, exclusive of the Establishment of Officers above mentioned.

This Expence may appear very considerable but I flatter myself, that if peace with and good Order Among the Nations that surround us, can be purchased with it, Your Lordships will not think the Money badly applyed. I need not mention to Your Lordships the great Sums that a Two Years War with The Cherokee Nations alone cost Great Britain, as well as the province of South Carolina, besides the Great Effusion of Blood and devastation of half that Province; and I beg leave farther to observe, that the Two Florida's can never be brought to Answer the Intent of Colonies or rendered useful to the Mother Country without Peace and Friendship be Maintained with the surrounding Nations, till they arrive at such a State of Maturity as will make them respectable and enable them to stand alone: and if they are to be supported by a great Military Force, as the Most Eligible alternative, The above Expence in a comparitive point of View will appear but small. At the same time I am conscious that the sum of £15000 Sterg Annually is more than the Indian Trade in this department will bear; and I doubt much if Furrs and peltry, exclusive of Beaver, in both Departments will defray the Expences of the Indian Establishment, without including the Hudsons Bay Company's Trade, or the Provinces contributing to the Support of an Establishment by which they will reap such great advantages.

My Zeal to forward His Majesties Service and obey Your Lordships Commands, induces me to submit my sentiments with plainess and Candor, as I consider the preservation of Peace with and introducing good order among the Indians as the principal Object pursued:

I proposed the Limitation of The Traders and settling the prices of Goods by Tariff as essentially Necessary to attain it. If extending our Trade was the sole point in view, I am conscious that Objections from the freedom which is an essential principle of Commerce would unanswerably arise to the proposed restrictions; but in the prosecution of this plan they appear to me indispensibly Necessary.

I am likewise conscious that some alterations which, in obedience to Your Lordships Commands, I thought my Duty to propose in the general plan may draw upon me the Imputation of wanting to throw too much power into the Hands of the Superintendant, which Office I have at this time the Honour to fill, and in which as I am conscious of having always endeavoured to discharge my Duty faithfully, I hope for His Majesty's gracious Continuance.

I most sincerely wish to see the powers Necessary for the Execution of this Plan so placed, that they may Effectually Answer every End proposed by them, whilst no person can have it in his power to make a bad use of them.

Your Lordships great knowledge will distinguish, what may be useful in the above observations, and reject the rest; but I consider a *Line* by which the powers of the Different Governors in Indian Affairs and that of the Superintendant may be clearly ascertained and pointed out as essential to the Intent of this plan: and likewise that it shall be clearly determined how far the P[r]ovinces shall For the future have the power of Making Laws for the Government of Indians, and regulating the Trade to their respective Nations.

All which is most Humbly submitted by

My Lords
Your Lordships
Most Obedient and
Most devoted Humble Servant

A List of Indian Tribes in the Southern District of North America.[26]

		Gun-Men
Cherokees		2800
Creeks		3000
Chicasaws		500
Chactaws		5000
Catabas		70
Beloxies, Chactoes, Capinas, Panchaculas, Washaws, Chawasaws, Pascagulas	On the British side of the Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain	251
Tonecas, Affoulas, Querphas	On the East side of the Mississippi and above point Coupee	200
Tuscaroras	In North Carolina	100
Nottways, Saponys	In Virginia	60

[26] Consult *Handbook of American Indians.*

Natchees, Utchees, Savanahs	Near the Creek and Cherokee Nations	160
Cascaskias, Caskeyas	Tribes at the Illinois if that shall be determined to be in this district	200
Humas, Callipisas, Tensas	Upon the Island of Orleans	150
Chattimasaus	On the French side of the Mississippi. Two Leagues below point Eberville	100
Italapales, Ucanachitees, Peluches, Attacapas	Opposite to, and a little above point Iberville on the French side	150
Apalaches, Natchetoches, Addays, Cadoes, Lasonettes, Ayches, Amadyches	On the River Rouge	350
Arkansas	On the River of that Name	250
	Total Number of Gun-Men in the Southern District	13941

Altho' many of the Tribes contained in the above List are not properly speaking in the Southern District, being in the French part of Louisiana, yet it is of great Consequence to cultivate their Friendship, as they have it in their Power to obstruct Our Navigation on the Mississippi and prevent our making Settlements on the Eastern Bank of that River, by far the first part of West Florida; Yet any Intercourse with them should be with the Knowledge of the Governor of New Orleans, to remove every Pretext for his interfering with Our Indians without our Consent.

Calculation of Extraordinary Contingencies in the Southern District.

Annual Presents to the Chactaws and Nations on the River Mississippi	£3500.—
To the Cherokee Creek and Chickasaw Nations	2500
Provisions, Wine, Tobacco and Rum at General Meetings and to visiting Parties	2000
Commissary of presents and provisions in West Florida at 6/3 [6*s.* 3*d.*] p day	114.1.3
The same in East Florida	114.1.3
To an Interpreter for the Chactaw Language and one Ditto for the Creek Language at Mobile @ 1 Dollar each p Day	170.6.8
The same at Panzacola	170.6..8
To One Interpreter for the Creek Language at St. Augustine	85.3.4
For Expresses, particular Gratifications, Carriage, Horsehire, occasional Deputies, and other unforseen Contingencies in this Department	2346..0..10
	£11,000..—

In the above Estimate I calculate the Expence of Interpreters living in the Provinces @ 85.3.4 p Ann each, and of those residing in the Different Nations @ 50.— only because Men may be had in any of the Nations, who will gladly accept of such Settlements, but No man can possibly live in either New Province for less than £85 p Ann.

I beg leave to observe to Your Lordships that purchasing the presents in the Cheapest Manner in England will be Necessary in Order to keep within the sum proposed by the above calculation, which is not much more than the Charge of One Regiment in Cantonment in America.

GOVERNOR JAMES GRANT TO THE BOARD OF TRADE, DECEMBER 1, 1764.[27]

ST. AUGUSTINE 1st December 1764.

My Lords

In my Letter of the 22d Ultimo, I had the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's Plan for the future management and Direction of Indian Affairs, Which I have considered, and shall now take the liberty to Report my Opinion upon the particular Parts of it; upon which you wish to receive further Information and Intelligence.

The Expedient of naming the several Nations to be comprehended in each District, will answer better than the natural Boundary of the Ohio, Because the Indians, by that means, may be continued in their former Channel of Trade, And an Innovation with them, tho' apparently to their Advantage, will always be attended with Difficulty.

The Nations upon the Ohio were supplied, by the French, from Quebec and Montreal, at Presque Isle, Riviere au Beufs, Venango, and Fort du Quesne; They never had any Communication with the French in Louisiana, And therefore they fall more properly under the Northern District, because they will Chuse to Trade at the places which I have mentioned and those can be easily supplied with Goods, as there is a water Communication to them, from New York by the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers and the Lakes Ontario and Erie, and from Canada by the River St. Laurens, a few Carrying Places in each of the Navigations Excepted.

I find Your Lordships' have included the Illinois Indians in the Northern District. Their Trade has always been carried on with the French from New Orleans, they never had much Communication with the Canadians, except in Cases of great emergency a little before the Reduction of that Country: They must, I imagine, be supplied with goods, up the Mississippi, from West Florida, that will be the least expensive Carriage. And therefore I apprehend those Nations will more properly fall under the Southern District.

Carrying on a Trade with Indians at established Posts, is by much the most eligible Method, and it would be to the Advantage of Government, If that Plan could likewise be extended to the Southern Provinces, But as such a Change, with many of those Nations with whom we are but little acquainted, would be attended with too many Inconveniencies and Difficulties to be Attempted at present, That matter may come under

[27] P. R. O., C. O. 323: 19, 20. Indorsed: "Letter from James Grant Esqr., Govr. of East Florida, to the Board, dated Decr. 1, 1764, containing his Sentiments on their Lordships plan for the future management of Indian Affairs. Recd. Janry 30, 1765. Read. 1 Paper."

Your Lordships Consideration when we become more connected with those Indians.[28]

The Towns, belonging to each Tribe, may be considered as so many Different Republicks which form one State, but each of these Towns has seperate Views and Interests; They have frequent Disputes amongst themselves, And are all Jealous of One-another; They often join against a common Enemy, but that is not always the Case, for there are many Instances of some Towns killing their Traders, when other Towns of the same Tribe protect theirs and receive in a friendly manner the Traders who happen to make their Escape from the Hostile Towns.

Therefore, My Lords, to avoid giving Umbrage to any of the Towns, It will certainly be Adviseable to open a Trade to each of them, which is likewise necessary on Account of the Distance there is betwixt the Several Towns of the same Tribe.

If the Officers, who are to be appointed, reside constantly in any One Town, It will undoubtedly give Offence to all the Rest; besides, the Indians will become too well Acquainted and too familiar with their Commissary upon whom they should be accustomed to look with Respect. —I would therefore humbly propose to Your Lordships that the Commissary for the Lower Creeks should reside at the Fort of St. Mark's near Appalachi, he can go from thence as often as he pleases into the different Towns of that Tribe to inspect into the Conduct of the Traders, and to hear Complaints from both sides, which are never believed at a distance, for, without exception, I have never met with either an Indian or one of their Traders who speak truth when their Interest is concerned. St. Marks will likewise answer much better for the residence of the Smith, for if he was to live in one of their Towns they would apply to him for the least Trifle which happened to their Arms, Many of them would go at the same Time, and All of them would be impatient to have their Work first done, And it would be impossible for the most industrious Trades-Man to please them.

The Albama Fort, upon the River Mobile, will answer equally well for the residence of the Officers appointed for the Upper Creeks—And Tombigby Fort,[29] upon a River which runs into the Mobile River, for the Chactaws, tho' that Nation is so very numerous that probably more

[28] The article in the proposed plan reads: "That no Trade be allowed with the Indians in the Southern District, but within the Towns belonging to the Several Tribes included in such District and that in the Northern District, the Trade be fixed at so many Posts and in such Situations as shall be thought necessary." *Op. cit.* It is probable that the criterion for determining upon this difference of policy was the contrast in the economic and political organization of the northern and southern tribes. The northern nations did not possess the same settled habits as characterized the southern Indians. John Stuart, who makes no direct criticism of this provision, observes on another occasion: "The Indian Nations in this department are fewer than in the Northern but they consist of greater numbers of men, live more compactly and contiguous to our Provinces and more in community with each other than the northern tribes and the Provinces in this Department are much weaker and less able to support themselves in the event of an Indian War than those in the other Department." Stuart to Pownall, August 8, 1766, P. R. O., C. O. 5: 67. He thus intimates that the same policy might be impracticable in the two departments. See also articles 18 and 19 of the plan, wherein this general principle is emphasized.

[29] See note 17.

than one Set of Officers, will be thought necessary for them. The Officer for the Cherokees will be conviently situated at Fort Prince George.—The Catawbas are so few in Number that they will not require a Commissary.

The Chickasaws are such good People, so Tractable, and so much to be depended upon, that a place for their Commissary and Officers may be easily fixed upon by the Superintendant with themselves. I talk of them from Experience and not from Information, As I have had a Party of them under my Command. The other Indians, in the Southern District, I am a Stranger to.

If Your Lordships should approve of opening a Trade to each Town I would humbly propose that it should be restricted to One Trader for each Town. By that means in a little time responsible Men would be Established in the Indian Countries, the Cabals and disputes, which arise in every Town on account of the Traders, would be avoided, For Every Trader has his Indian Friends and Party, who are constantly at work to bring over some of the Indians belonging to the opposite Partys, to trade with their Patron preferable to their own: Each Trader is at work in the same way. They play a thousand Tricks to get the better of One another, And their Disputes have generally been the Cause of our Differences and Quarrels with the Indians, which at any rate, must soon subside, (as the French are removed). But I am convinced If Your Lordships are pleased to restrict the number of Traders in the way I have mentioned, We shall immediately be upon a better Footing with the Indians than we ever have been. But this Restriction, with regard to the Traders does not seem to be necessary where the Trade is carried on at Forts, under the Immediate Inspection of the Commissary.

The Indians know the Prices of Strouds, Blankets, Ammunition and Arms, very well. The Traders have not great profit upon these Articles, their principal Advantage is upon Vermillion mixed up, Knives, Scissors, Ear Rings and other Trifles. A tariff may very easily be fixed with the Indians, at the Rates, they are at present supplied with. And the Traders cannot possibly look upon it as a hardship, As they may see the Tariff when they apply for a Licence, and if they do not like the Terms, they may follow any other Branch of Trade they like better, for there will be people enough found to undertake it. It will fall a little heavy upon the Traders who supply the most distant Towns, but it does so at present, for Indians never make any Allowance for Distance or time, Those of a Tribe must all be supplied at the same Price, They never consider whether the Trader has five hundred Miles or Fifty to bring the Goods: for when they set out from their Towns, they would just as soon go the One Distance as the other, And they think it is quite the same thing to the Trader.

Your Lordships Plan for a Tariff becomes still the more necessary as no Indian Nation will ever be satisfied if the Prices of Goods, in their Country, vary.

The Regulation proposed by Your Lordships in the 18th and 19th Articles of the Plan, would no doubt be of great Utility, but I am afraid it will be difficult to carry it into Execution, 'till the Indians are a little more Civilized. The seperate Interests and Jealousies which I have already mentioned, would be a great Obstruction to it, besides there are so many Headmen in every Town contending for power, that it would be very difficult to prevail upon them to put their Affairs into

the hands of One Man Who by that means would claim a Superiority over the Others, And if all the Towns were to make their Elections, the Beloved Men of those Towns would never agree about the choice of One of the Number to attend the Superintendant.

An account of the Quantity of Peltry exported, can be best collected from the Custom house Books in the several Ports of America, for Indian Traders are no where to be depended upon. But it will be difficult at present to Ascertain, with any Degree of Precision, what a Tax upon the Indian Trade may amount to. The Quantity of Goods which the Chactaws may purchase with their Peltry is not known; The Demands from the Nations upon the Mississippi will not appear 'till the French are removed from New Orleans, And the amount of the Creek and Cherokee trade cannot be determined as the French have always had a share of it. The more Northern Nations have never been well Affected to his Majesty's Subjects since the Reduction of Canada, Much of the time of their hunting season has been employed in War, and no Opinion, I apprehend, can be formed from the Quantity of Peltry sold by some of those Nations the Year following that Conquest, because a Part of it was probably a Stock which they had upon their hands when the Canadians had no goods to purchase them with, which was the Case in 1758 and 1759.

The Duties upon this Trade can be best collected at the Ports where the Peltry is exported; if it is done in the Indian Towns, there will be constant Frauds committed, which would likewise be the Case if a Tax was put upon the goods which the Traders carry into the Nation. Peltry will bear a much higher Duty if the number of Traders is restricted in the way I have mentioned to Your Lordships, They will come to be people of Credit, will be able to commission their Goods from England, and have them at first Cost; And they can send their Peltry for the payment of those goods to their English Correspondents, the Peltry will come so much Cheaper to them, that tho the Duty upon Exportation should be high, their profits will be so much more considerable than they are at present, For as things now stand, An American Merchant Commissions the goods from England, The Traders are no Where in good Credit, the Merchant often sustains losses, and in order to make them up upon the whole he sells his Goods at Fifty per Cent profit without Distinction. This is the Case with the better sort of Traders. There is another Class of them who have no credit with Town Merchants, but are supplied from Store Keepers who settle upon the Frontier and purchase their goods at Fifty per Cent above the London Price, And do not sell them for less than fifty pr. Cent profit to the Bankrupt Trader, who often fills the Indians Drunk with bad Rum, and then Cheat them out of their Peltry.

Your Lordships will find, if the Trade Remains in many hands, that it will be impossible to prevent those frauds, The Security required will not answer the End, Those Traders are never at a loss to find a person who is ready to sign a Bond for them and so make Oath that he is worth double the sum he becomes bound for, tho' he has not a Shilling, for 'tis not to be conceived what a Sett of abandoned Wretches, live at present in Those Woods, who wander from One Province to Another and occasion disturbances everywhere.

Your Lordships have fixed the two Districts by naming the Tribes which belong to each, I should apprehend it would be of great Utility,

if you pleased to extend that Plan still farther and name the Towns of those Tribes to which the Several Governors may grant Licences, so that no Two Governors may have a Power to send Traders to the same Place. That has often Occasioned great Confusion.

I send Your Lordships a List of the Towns of the lower Creeks with the Names of their Head Men, and the numbers of their Gun Men and other Inhabitants, As those are the Towns with which this Province is most connected, but in the general Partition 'tis probable they will fall under the Governments of Georgia and the two Floridas.

'Tis only in Obedience to Your Lordships Commands that I have taken the liberty to offer my Sentiments upon a Subject which has already been under your Consideration.

I have the honor to be
My Lords—
Your Lops most Obedt. and most hbl Servant.
JAMES GRANT.

2. *Letter of Kamehameha II. to Alexander I., 1820.*

FOR the following curious document we are indebted to Professor Frank A. Golder, who found it in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at Petrograd, and who has contributed most of the information which we are able to give respecting it. It is found in a carton entitled "Dobell", and numbered 3601.

The reader who wishes to know more of the status of relations between the Hawaiians and the Russians at the date of the letter should consult the paper by Professor W. D. Alexander, "The Proceedings of the Russians on Kauai, 1814–1816", in *Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, no. 6. This is based on an article by Rev. Samuel Whitney in the *Hawaiian Spectator*, I. 49–51 (1839; the writer had got his information in Kauai in 1820), and from Tikhmeniev's *Istoricheskoe Obozrenie*, etc. (Historical Survey of the Formation and History of the Russian American Company) and Kotzebue. It does not appear that either the company or Baranov, its governor at Sitka, planned an occupation of Kauai, though apparently Baranov's agent, the German doctor Scheffer, so planned, building in 1815 the fort of which some remains are still visible. When King Tomaree, or Kaumualii, at Scheffer's instigation, asked to be taken under Russian protection, the emperor declined, and the same response was given in 1818 to a memorial in which Scheffer advocated the making of a Russian establishment in the islands.

When the letter was written, Kamehameha I., the great king who had made himself overlord of all the Hawaiian Islands, had been dead eight months. It was two months before the first American missionaries arrived, bringing with them from the United States George P. Kaumualii, the son of Tomaree.

Jean Rives, by whose hand the letter was written, was a low French sailor from Bordeaux, one of the dissipated young king's boon companions, half cook, half secretary.

Peter Dobell, by whose hand the letter was sent, was a native of Ireland. He served for a time in the Irish militia, came to America, is found serving as a private in 1794 in the Bucks County (Penn.) troop of horse under Captain Samuel Gibbs,[1] and with it took part in the expedition against the Whiskey Insurrection. According to his own account, he was made deputy quartermaster-general, with a rank equivalent to colonel of infantry in Russia, resigned, became a member of the Philadelphia corps of gentlemen infantry called "McPherson's Blues", went with them to Pittsburgh, and remained there till 1796. After this service he went abroad. On his return he sailed as supercargo to China. There he acquired a considerable fortune. From Krusenstern and others he heard that there was a scarcity of food in Kamchatka, and he therefore took two ship-loads thither in 1812 for commercial purposes. Thence he went overland to St. Petersburg in order to lay certain propositions before the emperor having to do with the trade of the North Pacific. He got himself appointed consul general to the Philippines, but the Spanish government would not recognize him. At the date of the letter he was on the way to Manila. He returned to St. Petersburg in 1829.

Sa Majete Imperial L'Empereur de Toutes Les Russies

Sire

Ayant toujours entandu qu' Votre Majeste Imperiale Est un Souverain tres bon et fort magnanime je suis porté de croire qu'Elle ne permettra jamais ses sujets de faire du mal à personne impunement.

J'Ecris Cette Lettre par La voie de Votre Consul General Monsieur Dobell actuellement ici pour informer Votre Majeste Imperial qu' La Compagnie Americaine Russes se comportée tres inimicale aupres de moi Car Elle á envoyée des Navires et des hommes pour prender une de mes Iles Nommé Wahoo.[2] O'uter de cela Elle pretends d'avoir achete L'Ile de Atohwy[3] du Roi Tomaree[4] et Elle á fait de reclamations pour avoir Cette Ile et paiement aussi pour un des Navires et des effets échouée par les Russes Sur la Cote. Comme le Roi Tomaree est Tributaire de nous il n'avait aucune droit de vender sette Ile. la Reclamation pour des objet vendu et pour un Navires que les Russes eux même ont échouee Sur no Cotes est egalement injuste. Je suis tres[5] alors qu' Votre Majeste ecoutera mes plaintes et qu' Elle ne permettra pas encore ses sujets de venir en Ennemie chez une Nation qu' desire tou pour La paix et

[1] *Pennsylvania Archives*, sixth series, V. 136.

[2] Oahu.

[3] Ataui, or Kauai.

[4] Or Tamoree; more commonly Kaumualii, sub-king of Kauai.

[5] Désireux [?] omitted.

Lamitié avec Votre Majeste Imperiale et tout Le Monde. Comptant tres fort Sur la generosité et la grandeur de Votre Ame J' demande qu' nous soyons amis et qu' Votre Majeste Imperiale me donnera Votre aide et Votre protection affermer Mon pouvoir et Le trone Laissée a moi seul par mon Pére Tammahamaha[6] mort depuis L' 8 mai L'Annee 1819.

N' sachant pas Nous même La Langue Francaise jei Commande mon Secretaire un francois Mr. Rives d'Ecrire Cette Lettre daquelle j'prie Votre Majeste Imperiale davoir La bonte de recevoir avec la même confiance comme si elle fut tout ecrit de ma proper main.

Pour Montrer lattachement qu' jai pour Votre nom, est Pour Votre Gloire, j'ai vians de donner à votre Consul General un Canoo fatePar Les natives de mes Iles dont je Prie Votre Majeste Imperiale de vouloir bian accepter Comme une marque du Grand respect et Estime de Votre tres humble

Serviteur etc
TAMAHAMAHA LE 2ND
Roi des Iles de Sandwich

Ministre D'Etat TRYMOKO
Secretaire du Roi des Iles de Sandwich
BARYESOKE RIVES

CAYROOHO[7]
Le 25 De janvear
L annee 1820

3. Salt Lake City in 1847.

IN going over old fur-trading documents at Hudson's Bay House in London, recently, especially at the period of the Treaty of 1846, a copy of a letter from the Mormons, then newly settled at Salt Lake City, was found. Their wish was to establish trade relations with the company at Fort Vancouver, under arrangement that the goods should be sent overland with the regular trading goods to Fort Hall or to Great Salt Lake, as the officials might determine. The document gives a clear description of the settlement at that time, even to the arrangement of the buildings.

The letter was written a year and a half after the boundary settlement had been made. The Hudson's Bay Company was holding its forts, under agreement, until its possessory rights should be bought by the United States, or otherwise legally disposed of. James Douglas was in charge at Fort Vancouver, the actual governing head, his colleagues on the Board of Management being frequently at other posts.

No arrangement such as the Mormons wished seems to have been made. As Utah was American, and had never been part of the area held under joint-occupancy, the American law forbade such arrangements as to traffic. Additional goods may have been sent to

[6] Or Kamehameha.
[7] Kailua, the royal residence, on the west coast of Hawaii.

Fort Hall, and sold from there, as part of the company's sales, but the sales reports do not indicate any extensive business with the Mormons.

Great Salt Lake was known to both British and American fur traders. In the years of early struggle for the beaver of the Snake River country, in the 1820's, Peter Skeen Ogden is known to have visited it, and other British trapping parties came near it, in their frequent tours down the Snake River to its source, thence around the Salt Lake region, and back over the mountains southwest to the Bonaventura Valley and the California coast. It was a source of resentment to the Americans that the British came so far inland.

The letter explains itself. The spelling, punctuation, and capitalization of the copy have been retained. The original of the letter was not found. KATHARINE B. JUDSON.

GREAT SALT LAKE CITY, Great Basin,
North America, Dec. 7, 1847.

To the Board of Management of the Hudson's Bay Company

Gentlemen:

At the request of your agent Captain Grant of Fort Hall, and in accordance with our feelings and views, we take the liberty of writing you this brief letter.

We as a people, commonly called Mormons, began to settle in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, the latter part of last July and have laid out a city in Latitude 40° 45′ 50″, a plot of which we have furnished Captain Grant.

Our buildings at present for reasons of advantage, are in the quadrangular form common in Western posts, the outside lines 190 rods long by 40 rods wide, with three cross walls at convenient distances; this fort, as we call it, contains not far from 600 houses, built of logs and sun dried bricks, and accommodates comfortably a population of about 3000; we have built this fort since the 2nd of August, most of it since the 1st of October, laboring at the same time with many disadvantages. Our location has so far proved itself delightful as to climate, rich in soil, with timber sufficient and verge and scope of land ample for the exertion of our industry to its utmost stretch.

We have plowed and sowed with winter wheat about 2000 acres and purpose putting in 3000 or more acres in spring crops in the season thereof, the seed for which, together with all the property we have on hand we have brought in wagons from 12 to 15,000 miles.

The plot of our city will be forwarded you by the Captain Grant and will explain itself; at the same time, while building it up we expect to form settlements at different points in the valley, and in neighboring valleys, according to the accommodation of our members, which as near as we can safely calculate will increase from 3000 this winter to 10,000 the coming winter, and in proportion the season after next, if not longer.

Your judgment and experience will readily suggest to you that there will be many articles of trade we shall need and be obliged to buy from some quarter before we can manufacture the same at home, and will be

also obvious to you that from our inland position, it will be difficult to bring goods to us and for the same cause our produce will avail us but little in exchange for your commodities any farther than your establishments in our vicinity might require and the supply of western emigration, still there is and will be more or less money in our midst and probably no inconsiderable share of peltries; we therefore at the request of Captain Grant respectfully solicit your Honorable Board to furnish us as soon as convenient a list of articles of use and necessity in our position, with the prices annexed calculated for this city or Fort Hall according to which place you choose to land them.

To guide you in making out your list for our trade, we take the liberty of specifying a few articles, viz., Sugar, coffee, bleached and unbleached domestics or cotton cloths, cotton drillings, calicos, woolen goods, moleskins, blankets, iron, steel, powder, hollow ware, leather, and such other useful articles as may occur to you that will warrant so lengthy a land carriage.

We would remark that in case you saw fit to send your goods direct to your place, we feel to write to you that we will use influence to have the channel of trade in your favor, to the utmost extent that your prices will warrant when compared with what can be done in other directions.

We have already 1 grist mill in operation and 4 saw mills in rapid progress to completion.

We close by soliciting an answer at as early a date as possible; and subscribe ourselves respectively your friends and well-wishers and desirous of the peace of all men.

JOHN SMITH, President
CHARLES A. RICH }
and } Councillors
JOHN YOUNG }

Done in behalf of the Presidency and High Council
of the Great Salt Lake City,
this 7th day of December, A.D. 1847.

ALBERT CARRINGTON, Clerk

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Essays in Legal History read before the International Congress of Historical Studies held in London, in 1913. Edited by PAUL VINOGRADOFF, F.B.A., Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence, University of Oxford. (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1913. Pp. viii, 396.)

THIS volume contains a score of essays on topics of Roman, English, Germanic, Slavonic, canon, and comparative law. They are introduced by a presidential address in which Professor Vinogradoff discusses the continuity of cultural tradition and the value of comparative study in universal jurisprudence, and the causes (among which he considers particularly important the "social type") which produce variations in legal principles. It is especially interesting to note his critical attitude toward legal theory, which is frankly expressed.

Roman law is represented by four contributions. Professor Wenger sets forth in stimulating fashion the inadequacy of our present knowledge when tested by the questions suggested by new social viewpoints in the light of recently discovered Byzantine and Egyptian papyri. These have opened up a world of inquiries relative to social status, the relation of law and economic conditions and of debtor and creditor, the land, associational forms, etc. Private, administrative, and procedural law are all in need of revision. Professor Lenel offers an exceedingly acute and unorthodox discussion of the history and meaning of *heredis institutio.* His primary theses are these: that there was no instituted heir until shortly before Plautus; that the comitial testament was a pure legatary will; that under the oldest testamentary system liability for the decedent's obligations rested on legatees and usucapients *pro herede* to the extent of the things they respectively acquired (*i. e.,* the liability rested, as in early Grecian and Germanic law, on the heritage); that, when the *familiae emptor* was replaced by the *heres scriptus,* the unlimited personal liability of the *heres suus* in intestate succession was transferred to wills and imposed upon an artificial instituted heir, partly in order to preserve the advantages of the *familiae emptor* as an executor and partly in order to spare creditors the inconveniences of limited real liability; the effectiveness of the will depending thenceforth on the *heredis institutio,* as formerly on the *familiae mancipatio.* This theory, which makes the earliest stage of the Roman law one of specific legacies, as in Grecian and Germanic law, leaves the *heredis institutio* as a feat of developed juristic technic,

and not an anomalous product of primitive customary law. Professor Riccobono's essay, "Dalla 'Communio' del Diritto Quiritario alla Comproprietà Moderna", is much the longest of the volume. It is an elaborate examination of the classical and Justinian texts. The author finds that the early and classic form of joint property rested upon the complete independence of the individual co-owners, the *dominium ex jure Quiritum* existing unfettered in each; there was no undivided ownership by a group, whether with or without juristic personality. This system, however, was profoundly altered in the Digest, the Quiritary principles being tempered by ideas of co-operation in the common interest, each co-owner acquiring the power to constrain all or to restrain his fellow "without regard to the interests" of any individual co-owner—*i. e.*, by an appeal to law. The construction of the essay is permeated with foreseen conclusions and some generalizations might be debated, but it unquestionably is of great and original value.

Of the three essays dealing with Germanic law the most widely interesting will be Professor Caillemer's on "Les Idées Coutumières et la Renaissance du Droit Romain dans le Sud-Est de la France". He rejects Ficker's theory that the Burgundian law survived in this region, and shows that there existed here, on the contrary, a vigorous customary law which made slow and difficult the spread of Roman ideas, notwithstanding that the earliest renascence in France of the classic law occurred precisely in this region. He discusses the divergencies of the native from the Roman system in the conceptions of real rights in immovables, of even-handed contracts (*à titre onéreux*), of real and personal suretyship, of rights of co-alienation (*laüdatio*); and, especially, in the history (fully outlined) of dowry and dower. Professor Schreuer discusses very briefly the gods and the dead as bearers of rights in Germanic law, and Professor Taranger deals exhaustively with the meaning in old Norwegian law of "óðal" (inherited or family, as distinguished from purchased, lands) and "skeyting" ("transfer of óðal-right in óðal-land" according to the author, "transfer of property in land" according to the current views which he combats).

Public law is represented by a paper of the late Professor Esmein on the influence in France of the maxim "princeps legibus solutus est", which was literally understood and applied, whereas in Roman law it had the limited technical meaning of discretionary self-exemption from the private and police law. Dr. A. Lappo-Danilevski describes the change in the conception of the state in Russia, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, from that of a predominantly theocratic to a predominantly secular institution. It is curious that a leading part in the dissemination of foreign literature was played by university courses in theology dealing *de iure et iustitia*.

Students of constitutional history will be interested in Professor Hübner's account of the constitution drafted in the Frankfort Parlia-

ment by the Seventeen Selectmen. It is based on minutes of the meetings, hitherto unknown, left by Droysen. There are also two studies of the principle of majority rule: one by Dr. Konopczynski dealing with the Polish *liberum veto,* the antithesis of that principle, and one by Professor Gierke. The contrasts between these essays is remarkable. Dr. Gierke's history is full of references and implications of borrowing and interaction. Dr. Konopczyński declares that the principle "ne fut octroyé nulle part, ni emprunté à des étrangers", etc. It is worth reflecting on when reading the two essays.

Reference must be made to the papers on English law: Dr. Odgers's history of the Inns of Court (but with no contribution to the theory or history of associations); Professor Goudy's discussion of the maxims *actio personalis moritur cum persona* (which never meant what it says and which he finds entered the law owing to Bracton's misunderstanding of the Roman law) and *cujus est solum ejus est usque ad coelum*; Dr. Holdsworth's views of Coke's influence; and Dr. Hazeltine's restatement of the researches of himself and other scholars in the early enforcement of legal remedies in the common-law courts. There is no space to consider them in detail.

F. S. Philbrick.

Deliverance: the Freeing of the Spirit in the Ancient World. By Henry Osborn Taylor. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1915. Pp. vii, 294.)

Mr. Taylor's authoritative and penetrating interpretations of the spiritual content of history promote historical studies, enrich philosophical insight, and add to the pleasure of those who accept erudition only in attractive literary form. To consider them only as contributions to historical knowledge is a too limited and one-sided procedure, and in the case of his most recent work the limitation is an embarrassment. "This little book which is not intended to be learned" (p. 77) adds not to the world's erudition but to the world's wisdom. The content of it is historical but the end in view is meditation on the spiritual problem of human life. For the book springs from such reflections as visit a man when he is alone with himself and is asking by what kind of endeavor he may find "his working satisfaction", "his freedom to fulfil his nature, his release from fear, his actual adjustment with life and the eternal ways". In particular such reflection seeks release from the anxiety of the thought of death. How have great souls won their serenity and composure of spirit, their triumph over the world? It is in this quest that Mr. Taylor surveys ancient philosophies and religions, not to give any such ample account of them as belongs to a history of thought, but to exhibit in Confucius, Lao Tzu, Zarathushtra, Hebrew prophets, Greek thought, Jesus, Paul, Augustine, the essential conception which gave them "singleness of spiritual foundations" bringing into accord intellectual conceptions and the heart's devotion.

It seems to the reviewer that this selective interest has maintained itself most consistently in the delightful chapters on Greek poetry and Greek philosophy, while elsewhere, as in the chapter on the Prophets of Israel, the restricted point of view has been lost in the pleasure of presenting a complete sketch of Hebrew religious history, possibly because that was a fresh field for the writer to master and the full survey of a new estate was an interest by itself.

Mr. Taylor's competency to acquire and survey is not to be questioned, but there is one instance where looking for the central *Wesen* of a teaching in the spirit of his main quest he is led astray from the path of history by his meditative interest. Being himself of Johannine kinship, Mr. Taylor expounds Jesus by the control of the Fourth Gospel, showing an insecurity of judgment in the use of the Synoptic records and feeling entitled to expound the inner consciousness of Jesus by the Johannine interpretation. It is a misfortune thus to have attention rest on the personal relation of Jesus to God and to lose the intense concentration of life on the kingdom of God which was the theme of the Jesus of history. Criticism surely establishes that the historical Jesus offered singleness of spiritual foundations to men not by elucidating before the world the mystery of his personality but by challenging men to the practical idealism of living by the law of the heaven which was to come to earth. This view of criticism would have made Mr. Taylor's chapter on Jesus more effective for his main purpose. Being in this mood of partial regret one is tempted to regret also that Mr. Taylor did not use for his purpose the pertinent and impressive materials contained in Cumont's *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans.*

Apart from this modest dissent, one finishes the book with a misgiving. Release from fear, adjustment to inevitable conditions of a world which has a death-angel, is an overworked motive. The implication is that all the great interpretations of life spring from the still sad music of the *vita contemplativa* and are in fact a spiritual epicureanism, a release from heartache. And the book ends after all with the melancholy of uncertainty. Were there then no urgencies of joyous discovery building great systems of faith, no spontaneous flights of unreflecting instincts not "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought", was there so little of the sheer and rapturous impulse to know, to see the fullness of being and to grasp it in some firm unity for the gratification of theoretic reason unconscious of the pragmatist need of a result on which the heart could appease its devotion? There have been many attempts to reduce these complex creations of history to one motive origin, intellectual, emotional, economic, or what not, and the attempts are not commendable. If we are asked to think that fear was the primal source of these great complete visionings of experience, we seem to be invited to forget the rich and varied spontaneities that make men creative. Doubtless Mr. Taylor would answer that he has

not been offering an explanation of these productions but a valuation of them in relation to a need which recurs hauntingly to the hours of reflection. Even so, the restricted appreciation may effect a certain distortion. The great faiths afforded not one but many liberations and "adjustments".

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

Roman Ideas of Deity in the Last Century before the Christian Era. Lectures delivered in Oxford for the Common University Fund by W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A., Hon. LL.D., Hon. D.Litt. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1914. Pp. vii, 167.)

IT is a fundamental and difficult theme which the author handles in the six lectures which make up this book. Essential as it is for the student of any religion to apprehend as clearly as possible the notions of deity which were current at any given period, these notions are exactly the ones which are hardest to grasp because the causes which determine them are most elusive. In his opening lecture Fowler points out that the natural difficulties are increased in the case of Roman religion because it was peculiarly hard for the Roman himself to conceive of divinity as distinct from supernaturalism; all his interest was fixed on the cult rather than on the *numen* toward which the cult was directed; he regarded the ritual as of prime importance because thereby he maintained right relations with the controlling powers, but he had no inclination to speculate about these indistinct powers. The result was that even in the last century before our era the Romans were able to realize deity but faintly.

Fowler then goes on to show that there were four ways by which a slight realization might be obtained. The first of these was through family worship. Vesta and the Di Penates represented in their way concepts of beneficent powers which gradually gained something like the character of divinities. The *genius,* who ultimately in Roman thought attained immortality, stood for the life-giving principle which secured permanence to the family and gens, and then for a divine protecting power, almost personal, which cared not only for men but for social groups and places. Finally in the cult of the dead we see reflected the common feeling that life is continuous.

The second means by which divinity was realized was through the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. There can be no question that most of the gods of the state were moribund or quite dead in Cicero's day. This was not true however of the divinity who from the Capitol presided over the state. Partly perhaps from an inherited strain of monotheism—if that view be right which sees a monotheistic tendency among uncultured races—partly owing to the syncretistic tendency of the time, Jupiter was regarded as one with that world-spirit of the philosophers which was now familiar to the Romans; he was thought

to be the divinity which had created the empire and so was more or less closely identified with the Stoic creative intelligence. A third way might have been furnished by the cosmic divinities like the Sun, or by Fortuna, but neither succeeded in attaining a sure position as a deity in the period under discussion. The fourth means was offered by the idea of a man-god and the deification of the Caesars. Fowler holds that the cult of the *divi*, of the *genius Caesaris*, and of the *dea Roma* was nothing more than the worship of the controlling force of the empire, which indeed was no deity at all. In his final chapter he shows how the idea of deity was degraded in the Augustan Age.

From one point of view all this is a dreary tale of degeneracy and lack of faith. But the learning of the author makes his book an illuminating study. Even when the reader cannot agree in matters of detail, he will gladly acknowledge his obligations to the whole work.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

Papers of the American Society of Church History. Edited by WILLIAM WALTER ROCKWELL. Second series, volume IV. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1914. Pp. xx, 215.)

THIS volume is made up of papers read at the annual meetings of 1912 and 1913. It fittingly opens with two addresses on the life and work of Professor Samuel Macauley Jackson (d. Aug. 2, 1912), to whom the reorganized society owes its existence, and with his unfinished paper on Servatus Lupus, which he had meant to use as a presidential address. These are followed by the next year's presidential address of Professor Joseph Cullen Ayer, jr., a solid study "On the Medieval National Church". Dr. Ayer, taking a position midway between Maitland and Phillimore, sustains the former in his denial that papal decrees needed any "reception" to validate them in England and admits that there was no such legal entity in England as a national church; but he holds that, not only in England but in other European lands, there was in the Church a sense of nationality and that social forces, such as the share of the local church in the general fortunes of the nation, its place in the constitutional system, or its treatment by the Roman See, tended to develop in it a national spirit and to give it in fact a unity which it did not possess in law. He vigorously urges the need of a comparative method of study, which shall no longer treat England as if apart from the rest of Latin Christendom.

The paper of Mr. C. H. Lyttle on "The Stigmata of St. Francis, considered in the Light of possible Joachimite Influence upon Thomas of Celano", is scarcely more than a learned foot-note. That of Professor David S. Schaff upon "John Huss's Treatise on the Church" describes and expounds this central writing of the Bohemian reformer, admitting its dependence on Wyclif, but claiming for it a high practical importance. The Rev. Dr. Edward Waite Miller, about to publish an English

translation of the "Farrago" and the letters of Wessel Gansvoort (the John Wessel of our older books), contributes a sketch of the relation of that reformer to the Reformation.

More startling to conservative readers will be the fine study on Luther and Toleration by Professor Faulkner, of Drew Seminary. With a fairness and a frankness still rare in the handling of this question, and with a knowledge both of the literature and the sources, he demonstrates the great gulf between the Luther of 1523 and the Luther of 1536. Yet is it not to exaggerate even that gulf to call the utterances of his *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit* "Luther's views on religious toleration"? When Luther wrote those utterances he was thinking only of the tolerance due *to* Lutherans; and that to Luther was always quite another matter from the tolerance due *from* Lutherans. And is it quite exact to say that even in 1536 Luther believed in the forcible suppression of heresy *as such,* when, though he believed in suppressing heresy, and with death, he would still not call it heresy? If this is quibbling, it is Luther's quibbling. It was not "some years later" than 1528, as Dr. Faulkner says, that Luther first consented to the death penalty. He was commending it to Menius early in 1530, and there is reason to date his change of view from the action of the Diet in 1529. As for the paper of Melanchthon to which he added his *placet,* that belongs, not to 1530, but to late October of 1531. But these are matters just being cleared up by research.

Professor Washburn, of the Cambridge Theological School, in a paper on the College of Cardinals and the Veto comes to the defense of that interference of the great Catholic powers with the freedom of papal elections. Nor will he believe that the days of the Exclusion are necessarily at an end. The "Sketch of the Religious History of the Negroes in the South", contributed by Professor Reed of the Theological Seminary at Columbia, South Carolina, is illuminating in many ways and is notable for its fairness of tone. It increases the impatience of the reader for that broader study of Christianity and Slavery on which Dr. Jernegan has been so long at work.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY

The Hussite Wars. By Count Lützow, Hon. D.Litt. (London: J. M. Dent and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1914. Pp. xiv, 384.)

This work is a companion volume to the same author's *The Life and Times of Master John Hus* (1909) which devoted only a chapter to the Hussite Wars. Of the eight chapters which make up the work, the first is devoted to the causes and the beginnings of the wars; the next six to the crusades and religious disputes within and without Bohemia; and the last to the conclusion of peace between the Bohemians on the one side and the Church and Sigismund on the other. The author

develops the thesis, now universally accepted, that "these wars were the result of three causes, the antagonism of the Bohemians to the Church of Rome, the revival of the Slavic national feeling, and the rise of the democratic spirit".

Count Lützow is a liberal Bohemian noble and patriot. The subject at hand is a veritable jungle of political, racial, and religious prejudices covering a morass of complicated and often unintelligible detail owing to the paucity of reliable information handed down to us by the chroniclers and their contemporaries. On the whole, he has kept his balance when judging between Roman Catholic and Hussite, between German and Bohemian, between conservatives and radicals in politics.

The author has given us a fresh account of John Žižka, the blind leader of the Hussites, whom he fittingly compares to Oliver Cromwell. Žižka is rescued from the charges of barbarity heaped on him by German Catholics, but the author does not hesitate to point out his lapses from grace to ardent Bohemian patriots who see in him a spotless idol. Illuminating also are the passages which describe that leader's contribution to military science, although the description of fighting as carried on by the Hussite rank and file is not always clear.

The latest researches of Neubauer (see *Český Časopis Historický*, 1910–), which the author has followed, have reconstructed the life of Prokop the Great, the Taborite priest, on whom fell the task of continuing Žižka's work after the latter's death in 1424. The result is that Prokop the Great is portrayed somewhat less ideally, but also with a due appreciation of the difficulty of his position caused by the decline in the morale of the Hussites and those who flocked to their standards in hope of generous booty.

The author frankly acknowledges his indebtedness to the leading documentary, general, and monographic works on the subject: to Höfler, Palacký, Pez, Goll, Tomek, Bezold, Juritsch, Neubauer, Toman, Köhler, and others. Hofman does not appear among those cited.

American readers would doubtless have been interested in chapters on social and economic conditions among the Taborites, who were the democrats of the Hussite movement. A concluding chapter on the political, economic, and social results of the Hussite Wars on Bohemia and the Bohemian nation would also have been welcome.

Few errors of fact may be detected. The repetition of the adverb "now" (as on page 60) burdens the style, which, considering that it is written by a scholar in a language not his own, is pardonable. Errors like the following have crept in in spite of the proof-reading: Válečnictoi for Valečníctvo (p. 23, note), Maintz for Mainz (p. 260), Palecký for Palacký (p. 284, note).

The present work is the best account of the Hussite Wars which has thus far appeared in the English language. Such adverse criticism as it merits is not due to any serious faults of scholarship, but rather to

the form and the manner of its presentation before an English-reading public.

R. J. KERNER.

A Calendar of the Court Minutes, etc. of the East India Company, 1650–1654. By ETHEL BRUCE SAINSBURY, with an Introduction and Notes by WILLIAM FOSTER, C.I.E. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. xxxii, 404.)

THE numerous documents in this fourth volume are chiefly from the *Court Book* of the company, though many short entries are drawn from state papers of various sorts at the Public Record Office. The usual high standard of production and apparatus is maintained. American interests are occasionally noted, as, for example, the successful colonization of Barbadoes. There is also frequent mention of the need of naval convoy in view of the danger from Channel pirates who were attacking the East India and Barbadoes fleets. The reason for this pooling of interests lies probably in the financial investments of members of the company in such American adventures. This matter of piracy, however, is of larger importance and we could well draw a picture of the dangerous conditions existing even in home waters. But greater matters are also treated.

First is the relation of the affairs of the company to English foreign policy. These affairs are at first affected by the royalist sympathies of the Continental maritime nations. The success of the Commonwealth navy and the use of privateers offered some protection to the company's shipping. But the Dutch War was a more complicated undertaking. The body of documents exposing the interests of the company in this matter is far too large to permit any detailed references, but they form a most valuable addition to the sources for this subject. Merely as an illustration is the petition of November 14, 1650, by the company for redress from the Dutch (p. 73). The course of the war and the settlement of outstanding questions in connection with peace add another series of frequent papers. In less important fashion is the final recognition by Portugal of English trading claims in the East. And in other, if often contradictory, ways the fuller entry of the company into a national policy is of importance. These and various affairs suggest the greater influence of "the City" on Westminster.

Secondly, comes the tangled matter of financial policy. It is impossible even to trace here the complicated questions connected with the raising of subscriptions. But the principles of the struggle regarding joint-stock companies, which played such an important part in the economic history of the seventeenth century, appear here in considerable detail. Petition and counter-petition, document after document, supply in concrete fashion the very stuff of business policy. In like if less frequent ways the problem of "private trade by the servants of the company" receives special treatment. As a matter of economic prin-

ciple the questions are similar; but administrative expediency had influenced the company. And in this period a marked relaxation of stringent prohibition of private trade may have had some relation to the problems of the company. In general the concluding documents of this volume point directly to the coming struggle over the granting of the new charter to the company by Cromwell.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, Secretary of State to Charles II. By VIOLET BARBOUR, Instructor in History, Vassar College. [Prize Essays of the American Historical Association, 1913.] (Washington: American Historical Association; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xii, 303.)

WITH the appearance of Miss Barbour's life of Arlington another link is added to the rapidly lengthening chain of Restoration biography which began so many years ago with Lister's classic *Life of Clarendon*, and has recently been so remarkably increased. There are, indeed, not many principal personages of that extraordinary period now without some sort of modern biography. Charles II., his wife, most of his mistresses, all of his chief ministers save two, Temple, L'Estrange, Ormonde, Argyll, Pepys, Mackenzie—the list is as long as it is miscellaneous. And if, in these contributions to Restoration history, two characteristics are noticeable above all others they are, first, that scarcely any other period in English affairs has proved such an attractive and fertile field for the production of biographical monographs; and, second, that it seems to have a peculiar fascination for that sex which played so great a part in its development.

To this collection Miss Barbour's volume is a welcome and valuable addition. If it cannot pretend to the bulk and exhaustiveness of Lady Burghclere's *Ormonde* it certainly surpasses that author's *Buckingham* both in method and content; and though it lacks the scope and interest of Mr. Christie's *Shaftesbury* in revolutionizing our ideas of its subject and period, it unquestionably adds much to our knowledge and something to our conception of one of the most elusive figures in Restoration politics.

That it does not add more is less the fault of the author than of her subject. Of all the leading personages in the reign of Charles II., it seems to be evident from these pages that Arlington will remain in history, as he was in life, one of the most difficult to evaluate properly in his relation to affairs and his permanent influence upon them. This is, no doubt, largely true because he was first of all a diplomat rather than a statesman, and it is never easy to adjudge the proper proportion of personal influence wielded by an intermediary. But, growing out of his profession, perhaps, there were certain qualities emphasized in Arlington's nature which make Miss Barbour's task doubly difficult. Despite her long and patient investigation, despite the many facts, both new and old, here brought together by her industry, despite her clear and syste-

matic presentation couched in a style fortunately far removed from so-called "thesis English", Arlington remains to us as to most of his contemporaries, a peculiarly unattractive, enigmatic factor in public affairs. As he began so he seems to have remained to the end, patient, unobtrusive, adroit, self-seeking, contributing but little of real light and leading to those great issues through which he moved so surely and inconspicuously toward wealth and power. A model courtier, a shrewd politician, a useful minister to a master like Charles II., he lacks even the principle of Danby, the picturesque quality of Buckingham, still more the fire of Shaftesbury. Half in, half out of either side, treading dangerous paths with marvellous security, he remains the peculiar product of a period in which, save for an ultimately futile foreign policy, his permanent influence for good was negligible.

Such is the final impression one receives of that minister-courtier-diplomat, who, save for the most sincere of his colleagues, Clifford, has hitherto received less attention than any member of the ill-fated Cabal. The general opinion of Arlington will probably be little changed by Miss Barbour's book. Its value lies in the details she has added to the knowledge of the tortuous politics of the period. Nowhere has Arlington's relation to the Triple Alliance been so clearly revealed, and though his connection with the true and false treaties of Dover has long been fairly well known, his change from "confident expectation of peace to passionate desire for it" and the "ill use" of the period succeeding the second Dutch War has never been so clearly recognized. Unfortunately it has, apparently, not been found possible to invade his refuge in collective ministerial responsibility for the acts preceding that struggle, and but little if any new light is thrown on the consequent impeachment and acquittal, where hung not merely the fate of Arlington and his colleagues, but the turning-point of Restoration politics. And if (not to exceed the limits set to the many questions and reflections which this volume inspires) it had been possible to discover the tracks which Arlington has evidently been only too successful in covering up, we should be able to clear up many problems in a perplexing period. Finally, apart from minor matters, it seems remarkable, in such a careful and exhaustive piece of work, that the author has not availed herself to a larger extent of some of the recent biographies and monographs which might have helped to illuminate the general field of Restoration politics and, by the reflected light, make Arlington's course at critical periods somewhat less obscure. W. C. Abbott.

Frederick the Great and Kaiser Joseph: an Episode of War and Diplomacy in the Eighteenth Century. By Harold Temperley, Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge. (London: Duckworth and Company. 1915. Pp. xvi, 273.)

Clausewitz used to maintain that, in war, more could be learned from a detailed study of a few operations than from a broad general account.

Believing that in diplomacy the same is true, Mr. Temperley has written an able essay on the manoeuvres, diplomatic and military, which accompanied the question of the Bavarian Succession in the years 1776–1779. The French, Prussian, Austrian, and Russian archival material on this episode has been explored by historians, but the English has been hitherto neglected. The peculiar value of Mr. Temperley's account lies in the thorough use which he has made of the English sources, particularly of the despatches of that distinguished English trio, Sir Robert Keith in Vienna, Hugh Elliot in Berlin, and James Harris in St. Petersburg. All three, however, shared a certain hatred of Prussia which went back to the rupture of the Anglo-Prussian alliance during the Seven Years' War and which was stirred again by Frederick's undisguised friendliness to the revolting American colonies. Mr. Temperley tries to be on his guard against their bias and devotes an incisive appendix to a critical estimate of the value of his English authorities. But in spite of the grain of salt with which he reads their lively despatches, he still seems to the reviewer to do Frederick II. less than justice at a number of points. He seems to overstate the decay in the Prussian army and the decrepitude in its leader, and to understate Frederick's desire to avoid serious war in the Empire. Frederick II. had had enough of fighting in the first twenty-three years of his reign. He had secured what he wanted. In the remaining twenty-three years, therefore, after the Seven Years' War, he sought to preserve the *status quo* and avoid an upheaval which might bring him losses. None better than he knew the truth of the proverb, *Chi sta bene non muove.* To prevent Joseph II. from consummating the Partition of Bavaria according to the secret treaty of January 3, 1778, and thereby too greatly increasing the Hapsburg power, it was, indeed, necessary for the Prussian king to make an energetic military demonstration, but it was not necessary for him to attempt a great battle or risk a winter campaign.

By the quality of his style, the mastery of his material, and the simplicity of his presentation Mr. Temperley succeeds admirably in making the Bavarian Succession episode serve as a canvas on which to paint "the typical elements of eighteenth century diplomacy: the intense personal influence of rulers, naked aggression veiled by genealogical pedantry, the struggle for the 'balance of power', the assertion of *raison d'état* as a plea for all crimes, the rapier play of contending forces, the ruthless crushing of small or neutral Powers by the military aggression of larger ones" (p. vii). Though he had virtually finished the main part of his volume three years before the present war began, Mr. Temperley takes occasion to point out (p. 150) the interesting fact that the German general staff has never made any special study of this last campaign of Frederick's, though it is perhaps the one which has most bearing on modern conditions: both the armies stood securely entrenched against each other for months. He also rightly emphasizes the decisive influence of Russia in settling German affairs at the Peace of Teschen.

In bibliographical notes he indicates the nature and value of most of the numerous foreign monographic studies. In appendixes he prints some amusing and unflattering descriptions of Frederick and his army by Harris, Elliot, and General Burgoyne; an English translation of a Czechish peasant's pious paean on Joseph II.; and an interesting conversation of 1782 in which Joseph II. confided to Sir Robert Keith his private impressions of his neighbor Catherine II.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

The Revolutionary Period in Europe (1763–1815). By HENRY ELDRIDGE BOURNE, Professor of History in Western Reserve University. [The Century Historical Series, edited by Professor GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, vol. VII.] (New York: The Century Company. 1914. Pp. 494.)

THE limits set by Professor Bourne to the period he has treated are 1763 and 1815, from the close of the Seven Years' War to the Congress of Vienna. No use is made of the conventional divisions—French Revolution and Napoleonic Era—although the space is about equally divided between these two, but the period is dealt with from the European standpoint and the matter distributed into twenty-seven chapters. The exposition passes naturally from a study of the conditions of the peoples and governments in Europe, through an examination of the Currents of Public Opinion and the Work of the Benevolent Despots, to an account of the French Monarchy as a Benevolent Despotism and the Fall of the Old Régime in France. Between the last two chapters is introduced a sketch of the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth century, especially in England. Although the topic is an important one and well handled, it seems out of place at this point in the exposition, breaking the continuity of the narrative. It would make a more natural and logical entrée in connection with the excellent chapter on the Continental System. The close connection between chapter XVII., a Beneficent Dictatorship, and chapter XIX., From Consulate to Empire, is broken by the chapter on Beginnings of Revolution in Germany; the chapter on the Reorganization of Prussia—XXII.—would find a more natural place before chapter XXV., the Last Great Venture, namely, the invasion of Russia. With these few exceptions, the order of topics seems excellent.

The choice of chapter headings has been uniformly happy, revealing the ripe scholar and the experienced teacher, and the chapters themselves are full of solid and important matter. Here, for the first time in a text-book, is to be found adequate treatment of such fundamental subjects as the reorganization of France by the Constituent Assembly, Finances and the Church, the Continental System, and the constructive statesmanship of Napoleon in France and in the other states of Europe. In a word, Professor Bourne has given us a comprehensive, scholarly, well-organized, and sober exposition of a very important period, the most satisfactory single volume on the subject yet published in English.

The book contains a bibliography, or "Notes on Books", of fourteen pages, chiefly of French titles. Professor Bourne knows the literature of his subject and has selected the choice things from the overwhelming mass of accessible material. Here and there an important book is missing. For the period of the French Revolution, I note the omission of: Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*; Ségur, *Au Couchant de la Monarchie*; Hardy, *Mes Loisirs*; Bray, *Mémoires*; Ardascheff, *Les Intendants de Province sous Louis XVI.*; Glagau, *Reformversuche und Sturz des Absolutismus in Frankreich*, and, by the same author, *Die Franz. Legislative*; Becker, *Die Verfassungspolitik der Franz. Regierung bei Beginn der grossen Revolution*; Mathiez, *Le Club des Cordeliers*; Dodu, *Le Parlementarisme*; the works of Vecchio, *Su la Teoria del Contratto Sociale* and *La Dichiarazione dei Dirritti*; and Seligman, *La Justice en France pendant la Révolution*. The failure to include articles from reviews, although intentional, was, it seems to me, a mistake. Sometimes the only scholarly treatment we have of some important topic is found in a review and quite as accessible as many of the books referred to. There is so little in English on this period—I mean, so little that bears the hall-mark of scientific work—that if it were all referred to it would not overload the bibliography. Every student of the French Revolution should be acquainted with Professor Bourne's articles on the city government of Paris and the first Committee of Public Safety, published in the American Historical Review. Other studies are to be found in the *English Historical Review* and the *University Studies* (Nebraska). After noting omissions, it seems inconsistent to add that the bibliography is too long, but from a pedagogical point of view, the criticism is, I believe, sound. The bibliography is intended for the beginner who wishes to know the best thing that has been written on each subject, not all that has been written. It is assumed that he can use foreign languages. For such a student to read, in addition to Professor Bourne's volume, other short school texts and outgrown histories of the period, like Thiers, Mignet, and Carlyle, is a waste of time. If the number of titles were reduced, space would be gained, making it possible to characterize the volumes and to indicate what portion or portions should be read. The bibliography would be made more useful, if the full title of each work were given—author's name, title, number of volumes, place and date of publication—and if, under each chapter, the titles were grouped under secondary works and sources. The book has some excellent maps, but one more might be added making it possible for the student to find all the places referred to in the revolutionary and Napoleonic campaigns.

The publishers have done their part in producing an attractive and dignified volume. It maintains a high standard for the series of which it forms a part.

Fred Morrow Fling.

Private Papers of George, second Earl Spencer, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1794–1801. Edited by JULIAN S. CORBETT, LL.M. Volume II. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. XLVIII.] (London: The Navy Records Society. 1914. Pp. viii, 518.)

THE editor adheres to the topical plan of arrangement, which he adopted in volume I., and groups the documents contained in this volume in seven parts. The first, the sixth, and the seventh parts consist largely of the correspondence between Spencer and Jervis and Nelson relating to the operations of the fleets in the Mediterranean preceding and incidental to the battles of St. Vincent and the Nile. The second part contains papers relating to the mutinies at Spithead and the Nore, but nothing that adds much to our knowledge of the subject. Perhaps the most interesting document in this part is the statement of Richard Parker, the condemned mutineer. The third part is made up of papers relating to Duncan's manoeuvres in the North Sea and the battle of Camperdown. Part V. contains some interesting papers illustrative of the measures proposed to prevent the invasion which was threatened by the French in 1797–1798 and of Home Popham's expedition to Ostend in the latter year. The fourth part, including in all fewer than twenty pages, is occupied with "General Correspondence—March 1797 to May 1798". Among these few papers, however, are several of considerable interest. It is not easy to understand why Mr. Corbett printed "Mr. Pybus's Proposal for a Naval Order of Merit". But the secret order of the cabinet on July 19, 1797, that the members should hold themselves "bound not to communicate to any person whatever out of the Cabinet" (p. 213) the particulars of the negotiations between Malmesbury and the French ministers at Lille is of interest, as, likewise, is Pitt's letter to Spencer in the autumn of the same year, which gives an insight into the manner in which naval estimates were framed.

The documents in this volume that deal more particularly with naval matters are also of general interest, revealing, as they do, many things concerning the personnel, the methods, and the organization of the British navy in one of the most notable periods in its history. And even though the editor has succeeded only too well in his efforts to select papers pertaining solely to naval history, they nevertheless contain points that illuminate more general subjects. Henry Dundas, for example, appears in a more favorable light than that in which he is sometimes painted by the historians who write of his period, though he may have been inclined at times to be a little too blunt in the statement of his opinions to suit the taste of his more squeamish colleagues. He regarded the Cape of Good Hope as "in truth and *literally* so the key to the Indian and China commerce", and consequently he coveted it for Great Britain (p. 215). Before Bonaparte went to Egypt Dundas wrote to Spencer, "If any great European Power shall ever get possession of that country, the keeping it will cost them nothing, and that coun-

try so getting possession of Egypt will in my opinion be possessed of the master key to all the commerce of the world" (p. 318).

From the selections that have been published thus far it is manifest that Lord Spencer's papers are of almost equal importance for students of history with those of Pitt, Grenville, and other members of the British cabinet in that troublous time. It is regrettable, therefore, that those documents which would be of the greatest general interest are, in the language of the editor, "unfortunately too voluminous and too political" for publication in this series.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

A History of the Peninsular War. By CHARLES OMAN, M.A., Hon. LL.D., Chichele Professor of Modern History, Oxford University. Volume V. October, 1811–August 31, 1812. *Valencia; Ciudad Rodrigo; Badajoz; Salamanca; Madrid.* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1914. Pp. xiv, 634.)

AFTER the extended reviews of the earlier volumes of this work in this journal (VIII. 569; IX. 380; XIV. 131; XVII. 830), it might seem unnecessary to say more than that the present volume maintains the high standard set by its predecessors; but it does more, its incidents are of greater significance and interest; Professor Oman's handling of the complex problems is more masterly; and the narrative is rendered with more spirit and literary feeling than heretofore.

The first ninety pages tell the story of Suchet's campaign from the middle of September, 1811, to March, 1812, with the battle of Saguntum and the capture of Valencia. More than forty pages follow on the inconsequential siege of Tarifa and the minor campaigning. These pages are highly necessary to depict the background of Wellington's first great offensive, the siege of Ciudad Rodrigo. The diversion of troops from Marmont to Suchet in Valencia, and the achievements of the guerrilla leaders like Mina (pp. 102–104) so kept down the numbers available for the French Army of Portugal that Wellington, after two years and a half of campaigning, felt warranted in taking the initiative.

The sieges of Ciudad Rodrigo and of Badajoz with the consequent operations fill 140 pages; 200 pages more go to the campaign of Salamanca and the occupation of Madrid, with fifty additional pages on the synchronous lesser campaigns which kept more than half the French in the Peninsula distracted from the decisive operations. These major operations are described by Professor Oman with a fullness, accuracy, clearness, and realism that place his narrative ahead of Napier's. Napier's artificial literary luridity on the storm of Badajoz cannot compare for impressive effect with the simple but vivid realism of Oman's account. Napier glided over the disgrace of the sack in a brief paragraph; Oman hides none of its horror, and does not extenuate the crime though he presents clearly the military and ethical considerations

involved. In the description of Salamanca Oman has completely surpassed Napier.

Though Professor Oman writes primarily as a military historian, his treatment of the political situation is thorough and masterly. The chapters on Politics at Cadiz and Elsewhere (pp. 136–156) and on King Joseph as commander-in-chief (pp. 297–314) are illuminating. The effects of the emperor's efforts to manage the Spanish affair from Paris, of his drawing troops from Spain for the Russian campaign, and of his absence on that campaign are shown clearly and fairly, and are kept constantly in mind. Though Wellington is Oman's hero, the appraisal of his merits and faults seems done with even-handed justice. The judgments upon Suchet, Soult, and Marmont, though strict, are fairer than Napier's, which indulge Soult at the expense of Marmont. Oman is more severe with Napoleon than Napier, but makes his reasons clear and convincing. Compare Oman's "Napoleon was directly and personally responsible for the fall of Badajoz" (p. 214), with Napier's "The fall of Badajoz may therefore be traced partly to the Russian war. . . ." (book 16, chapter 7). Oman's correlation of events is masterly; only once are his phrases careless of precise synchronism, when he anticipates the Russian campaign by two months (p. 352). Such references to Napier as appear on pages 215 and 216 are unpardonable and should not be allowed to mar a future volume or a new edition, even granted that they are true.

New information has enabled Oman to correct and to supplement Napier at many points on matters of fact. The most notable materials which he has been the first to use are, as in the previous volume, the D'Urban and the Scovell papers. The peculiar interest of the Scovell ciphers is shown in Appendix 15, and the same papers furnish some hitherto unpublished despatches of the highest importance (pp. 370, 374, 394). The extensive appendixes contain a wealth of data of numbers engaged and of losses. There are fourteen excellent maps and plans, but every reader must frequently wish that a good map of the whole peninsula were available in each volume. The proof-reading has been so remarkably accurate that two or three errors are surprising. Ariège (p. 99), Trelliard (p. 134, etc.), and Dembowski (p. 131 etc.) are the correct forms. The note on page 605 referring to the death of Dembowski is inaccurate.

The note dated August 5, 1914, added to the preface shows that the volume was completed before the declaration of war, but the reader who has alternated its pages with those of the daily paper has found interest and instruction beyond what the author could have anticipated.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Geschichte der Befreiungskriege, 1813 u. 1814. Von Heinrich Ulmann. Volume I. (Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg. 1914. Pp. iv, 477.)

Professor Ulmann, best known perhaps for his biography of Emperor Maximilian I., has for many years been devoting his attention to the German War of Liberation. From the archives of several German states he has made valuable contributions on special topics connected with the political and diplomatic history of 1813. Unappalled by the mass of the existing literature, he is to be congratulated on his courage in attempting a new general account which shall worthily take cognizance of all the new material. He has mastered it, digested it, and given in foot-notes his reasons and references when his conclusions differ from those generally accepted.

The author does not attempt to give military movements in detail; military history, he thinks, belongs to the technical specialist interested in the lessons of tactics and strategy. One looks in vain, therefore, in his pages for a tolerable account of even such important battles as Gross-Görschen and Bautzen. His general map of north-central Germany is altogether inadequate, and there are no plans of separate battles. For the purely military side of the war, therefore, the English reader will find much more satisfaction in a volume like F. Loraine Petre's *Napoleon's Last Campaign in Germany* (1912) or in the Napoleonic books.

The special value of Professor Ulmann's work lies in his able statement of the shifting political situations and diplomatic moves, and in his keen analysis of the character and motives of the leaders of the period. In these fields he shows abundant knowledge, great fairness of mind, and the fruits of mature thinking. After an introduction of something over a hundred pages on the Napoleonic system and the effects of French rule in Germany and French failure in Russia, the author comes to Yorck's decisive act at Tauroggen. On the much discussed question whether Yorck acted independently without the king's knowledge and against his wishes (the older view of Droysen, Lehmann, Delbrück, and Schiemann), or whether he had some secret instructions (as maintained more recently by Max Schultze, Oncken, Blumenthal, and particularly by Thimme, in the *Forsch. zur Brandb. u. Preuss. Gesch.*, vols. XIII., XV., XVIII., XXI.), Ulmann believes that the older view is the only one which accords with Yorck's character and with the subsequent letters which he wrote to the king. The newer view rests on passages in the diary of L. von Wrangel, in which Wrangel claimed, in August, 1812, to have foreseen the collapse of the Russian expedition and to have been entrusted by Frederick William III. with a secret mission to make plans for withdrawing the Prussian army from French control. It has been argued, however, that the passages in question in the diary are in a different hand, in different ink, and of a later date than the unquestioned daily entries; Ulmann accepts this somewhat doubtful argument, and discredits these passages as a

fiction of Wrangel's phantasy suggested after the fact by the subsequent course of actual events.

In tracing the steps by which Prussia, finally allied with Russia, fought the spring campaign against a new French army, agreed to the armistice of June 4, and finally allied itself with Austria, the author does not seek to establish any startlingly new points. He gives, rather, a good clear synthesis of the researches of others, with particular attention to underlying motives. This first volume, which reaches only to August, 1813, closes with an interesting estimate of the influence of the newspapers and of the poets and pamphleteers. A second volume is promised at an early date.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Fürst Bismarck, 1890–1898: nach Persönlichen Mitteilungen des Fürsten und eigenen Aufzeichnungen des Verfassers nebst einer Authentischen Ausgabe aller vom Fürsten Bismarck herrührenden Artikel in den "Hamburger Nachrichten". Von HERMANN HOFMANN. In two volumes. (Stuttgart, Berlin, Leipzig: Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft. 1913. Pp. xx, 411; vii, 429.)

AFTER Bismarck's dismissal from office, it was universally known that the *Hamburger Nachrichten* was his organ, and that many of its communications and editorial articles were inspired by him. In some cases the content of an article left no doubt as to its source because no one but Bismarck could well have furnished the material. In other cases, in which it seemed probable that an article was his, there remained an element of doubt. For the historian, accordingly, the present volumes are of great value, for they contain a reprint in chronological order of articles inspired by Bismarck, from April 19, 1890—a month after his dismissal—to March 26, 1898—four months before his death. These articles, which vary in length from a single paragraph to a leader of 1500 or even 2000 words, number 375. Nor do these fully represent Bismarck's activity as "contributing editor"; for Hofmann gives a list with titles and dates of publication, of 273 other Bismarck articles. The importance of these volumes, not only to the biographer but to the historian, is that they substitute certainty for conjecture as regards Bismarck's authorship and thus make available, because authentic, a mass of previously doubtful Bismarck material. It is to be regretted that Hofmann did not enlarge his collection to three volumes and reprint all the Bismarck articles. His judgment as to the relative importance of the articles selected is probably in the main sound; but the biographer or historian may prefer to make up his own mind on this point, and it will be troublesome for him to be obliged to go through the files of the newspaper for eight years, even with Hofmann's key to aid him. Even for the general reader it is rather a pity that all the

articles are not reprinted; for Bismarck never spoke or wrote unless he had something to say and he was rarely dull. Many readers to whom the original files are inaccessible would like to see, for example, what he had to say about Cecil Rhodes and "Herr Oppert aus Blowitz", and how he treated such subjects as "Prince Bismarck as alleged 'sticker' and salary-grabber" and "England, the most virtuous country in politics".

The articles reprinted, as well as those listed only, fall roughly into three classes: (1) those correcting objectionable statements concerning Bismarck's career, aims, and policies; (2) those criticizing the foreign and domestic policy of Bismarck's successors in power; (3) those dealing with topics of interest in the political and economic discussions of the day. Articles of the first group are of course to be used with caution. Bismarck possessed, as he has shown in his memoirs, a highly reconstructive memory. Of greater value, in some cases of the greatest value, are the articles of the other groups. Some of them are of very special interest at the present moment. Bismarck's warnings against cutting loose from Russia and committing Germany to an unqualified support of Austria's Balkan aspirations (almost *passim*) read to-day like verified prophecies. The same may be said of his disapproval of German interference with Japan, when Germany co-operated with France and Russia in compelling Japan to give up its conquests in China (II. 298, 302). In an article of the first group, written to deny an assertion that he and Moltke were seriously at odds in 1871 regarding the policy of annexing Belfort, he made, almost *obiter*, the very interesting statement that, in the event of a "war on both fronts" it was Moltke's opinion that Germany should limit itself to the defensive against France until the contest with Russia should be carried to a successful termination. This statement having aroused question he reiterated it (II. 192–196, 206). In an article of the third group, written to urge governmental encouragement of German wheat-growing, we find a discussion of the danger of Germany being starved by a naval blockade (II. 217–218). There is no suggestion that such an attempt would be either illegal or immoral.

Hofmann was the channel through which Bismarck's inspirations flowed into the columns of the *Hamburger Nachrichten*. He made frequent visits to Friedrichsruh and to other places, in order to receive Bismarck's instructions; and he tells us that the prince frequently corrected his drafts before they went to press. Bismarck talked freely to Hofmann about events and persons, always distinguishing sharply between what was to be used in the newspaper and what was not to be used. Some of the material which Hofmann thus obtained he published later, in his own or in other papers; and much of this has been utilized by writers of Bismarck books. Some of the material given to Hofmann was used by the prince himself in his memoirs. Nevertheless, the personal notes and reminiscences which Hofmann has now collected, and

which he presents in the first half of his first volume, are in part new and are nearly all interesting. They constitute a valuable addition to the already extensive mass of Bismarckiana. Hofmann's intercourse with Bismarck, not only in its intimacy but in the amount of time passed in the prince's company, was incomparably more important than that of the garrulous and sensational Busch.

MUNROE SMITH.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

A Walloon Family in America: Lockwood de Forest and his Forbears, 1500–1848, together with A Voyage to Guiana, being the Journal of Jesse de Forest and his Colonists, 1623–1625. By Mrs. ROBERT W. DE FOREST. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xxi, 314; ix, 391.)

IT is a mere truism to say that reliable private family records are precious contributions to colonial history, but rarely are such publications as valuable as the present volume. The introductory portion, to be sure, is not new, being based on *The De Forests of Avesnes (and New Netherland)* by John W. De Forest. This was a conscientious piece of genealogical work published in 1900 as the result of the author's researches in local history abroad. He succeeded in patching together a clear statement anent the family in the little Hainaut town of Avesnes and in linking the line of Jesse De Forest, *tincturier,* who emigrated with his family to Leyden (after ventures in other towns, in the first decade of the seventeenth century), to that of the merchants of Avesnes. Major De Forest's task was complicated by the variety of forms in which the name appeared in France and the Netherlands, where French families often lost their identity under the semi-translation of their names, both family and baptismal. It was necessary to thread a way carefully through a maze of De Freests, Van Foreests, etc., and to avoid being deceived by appearances or allured into claiming connection with such a family as the Van Foreests of Alkmaar, for instance. Major De Forest showed his knowledge of the many guises possible to his patronymic, and made out a good case establishing Jesse as the ancestor of the family who settled in New Amsterdam, although Jesse himself never saw Manhattan Island. He was known to have been among those who petitioned the English ambassador to Holland that the king should be asked to permit the settlement of "fifty or sixty families, as well Walloon as French", in Virginia, the settlers preserving self-government, their own language, religion, and customs. Fifty-six heads of families put their names to the famous Round Robin accompanying this request. It was refused, though the would-be emigrants were assured of a welcome in the English colonies if they would go by families and

mingle with the English. Baffled in this plan, Jesse turned his thoughts to another venture whereby he could establish his young family out in the New World where there was room to expand. From 1619 on, there were many colonization schemes initiated in the Netherlands, and the one in which he took part was directed towards the "Wild Coast" of South America by the efforts of the newly established West India Company (1623). Jesse De Forest was leader or "captain" of the ten heads of families who set forth in the *Pigeon* in July. Hitherto all that has been known of this expedition was in a meagre statement by Wassenaar. In 1901, the Rev. George Edmundson found among the Sloane Manuscripts in the British Museum a manuscript journal entitled "Journal du Voyage fait par les Peres de Famille envoyés par MM. les Directeurs de la Compagnie des Indes Occidentales pour visiter la Coste de Guiane". It is this journal that Mrs. De Forest has now published, first in narrative form and then entire in the original French and with English translation. In quoting from the earlier De Forest work, it may be said in passing, that Mrs. De Forest has made one or two trifling slips that do not appear in the original, as when she says in a note (I. 5) that "Hainaut was ceded to Spain in 1559", which was, of course, far from being the case, although it is true that various towns along the frontier, captured by the French in the wars between Charles V. and Henry II., were returned at the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis. The main part of the narrative of the immigration and later fortunes of Jesse's children in New Netherland is also based on source-works already well known, such as the *Records of New Amsterdam,* the *New York Colonial Documents,* the *Van Rensselaer-Bowier Manuscripts,* etc. For the Connecticut branch of the family, the author had Connecticut records, also available to the curious. But the Journal comes as a fresh gift and is a most interesting document. It seems to have been referred to in the Venezuela Boundary dispute, but otherwise it has lain as "Sloane MS. 179 b", unheeded as being the authentic story of one of the tragic colonizing episodes of the seventeenth century. Jesse De Forest never returned from Guiana. It was left to his children to make their own ventures in North instead of South America. Many incidental items of information are given in and between the lines of the Journal—possibly written by Jean Mousnier de la Montagne. Perhaps the most interesting is the circumstantial proof that it was in 1624 that the *Nieu Nederlandt* landed her ship-load of settlers on Manhattan Island, not in 1623 as has sometimes been inferred.

R. P.

Commerce of Rhode Island, 1726–1800. Volume I., 1726–1774. [Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, seventh series, vol. IX.] (Boston: Published by the Society. 1914. Pp. xiii, 525.)

We have in this volume the only considerable body of commercial correspondence relating to the American colonies which has ever been

printed. It is made up of letters which were written to four prominent merchants of Newport during the eighteenth century by their customers, agents, factors, ship captains, etc., in all parts of the world. The communications are few and scattering before 1750 but after that date they are numerous and while by no means complete, they give a fairly full account of the private business transactions of these merchants, who were more or less concerned with almost every branch of colonial commerce. This is a kind of information about business conditions very difficult to obtain for even recent times and rare indeed for the eighteenth century. It is important to determine the value of such a collection as an historical source. A careful reading of the letters reveals nothing concerning the ordinary features of colonial commerce which was not already well known, the commodities which entered into it, the communities between which it was carried on, and the economic conditions in these communities which gave rise to it. But how the trade was conducted, the commercial customs and practices which prevailed, the world-wide organization which was necessary for the transmission of funds, for the extensive use of credit which was so common, and for the insurance in England of vessels and cargoes in all parts of the world, all these subjects have been matters for pure conjecture hitherto or only to be inferred from a few scattered facts. Here for the first time we have available, in printed form, a considerable body of materials for their study.

One or two examples of the kind of result which can be gained from a study of these details may be noticed. Take the relations of the colonial merchant to his factor in London or Bristol, as they are here revealed. The latter not only acted as commercial agent, receiving and disposing of cargoes shipped to him, purchasing and despatching return cargoes, but more important still was his financial service. He really acted as a banker for the colonial merchant. The merchant in Newport was allowed to draw on his factor in anticipation of shipments of produce in the near and remote future; this really amounted to discounting the paper of the colonial merchant. It was this banking function of the factor which prevented the rise of commercial banking in America until after the Revolution. It is a remarkable fact that although the commercial activity of the trading communities in the northern colonies was almost as great as in Europe, it nevertheless occasioned no development of banking institutions. The explanation is found in the fact that the banking business was done by the factors. When this old relation between colonial merchants was interrupted by the Revolution, commercial banking promptly sprang up in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. Another striking feature of colonial commerce brought out in these letters is the great risk which was involved in it. The common term of "venture" applied to commercial enterprises at the time was well chosen. No merchant could be at all sure when he ordered his ship captain to sail to any port with a cargo of commodities

suited to its ordinary need, what would be the condition of the market when his ship arrived. It might be so glutted by the arrival of other ships that a large part of his cargo would have to be sacrificed. Over and over again we find the captain complaining of such condition, whether the cargo be slaves from Africa to the West Indies, candles, staves, fish, beef, and horses from New England to the same place, or mahogany and logwood from the Bay of Honduras to Bristol and London. These were the ordinary risks of peaceful times. It need hardly be said that war added to them a thousandfold. There is nothing in modern commerce to compare with these risks which the colonial merchant had to undertake in all his operations.

In conclusion it will not be amiss to add a word of caution against over-estimating the importance of commerce in the economic life of the colonies. This was the subject which engrossed the attention of the English government and their officials and so has been more written about than any other economic subject. But it should never be forgotten that, outside of tide-water Virginia and South Carolina, commerce played no such part in the economic life of the colonies as it does in modern communities. Nine-tenths and more of the products of all communities not located on tide-water never entered into commerce, but were consumed in the communities where they were produced. If we would understand the economic life of the people we must study these small self-sufficing communities, where the bulk of the people lived. The over-sea commerce of the colonies is important because it furnished the only opportunity for the individual to become wealthy, where there were no staples to be produced by slave labor, but it did not affect profoundly the life of the masses of the people. To reveal that, the account books and correspondence of a country storekeeper in some interior town like Litchfield or Stockbridge would be more valuable than the correspondence of the wealthy merchants in Newport. It is to be hoped that the society to which we are indebted for this collection of economic data will not neglect the other field.

Guy S. Callender.

Correspondence and Documents during Jonathan Law's Governorship of the Colony of Connecticut, 1741–1750. Volume III., January 1747–October 1750. [Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society, vol. XV.] (Hartford: Published by the Society. 1914. Pp. xxiii, 532.)

With the issue of the third volume of the *Law Papers,* covering the period from 1747 to 1750, the Connecticut Historical Society has carried well along toward completion the publication of the correspondence of Connecticut's governors in the eighteenth century. The first volume of the *Talcott Papers,* beginning the series with the year 1724, was issued in 1892, and there are still the Wolcott and Fitch papers to follow. No state historical society, dependent solely on its own re-

sources, has rendered to colonial history quite so unique a service as this, or has organized its activities in a form at once so systematic and continuous. The value of the plan is evident. In these five volumes we have, first, an index to the internal concerns and external relations of the colony during twenty-five years of a period that has been commonly neglected of historians, and, secondly, a mass of documentary material that discloses the importance of those years, not only for the domestic life of the colony but also for its relations with other colonies and with England. In many ways, Connecticut was the most independent self-governing unit of the entire colonial group and, as one might readily imagine, the one farthest removed from the interfering authority of the mother-country. Yet after reading the documents here printed no one could support the contention that the status of Connecticut was not that of a colony, or that its career was not affected constantly by the relationship which that status involved. Much light is thrown also on the intercourse with adjoining colonies and on the difficulties that arose whenever common action was sought for, as in the proposed meetings for defense at New York, Middletown, Albany, and Portland, or at Boston for considering the money grants by Parliament. The most prominent single matter dealt with in this volume is financial, touching bills of credit and the money allowed by Parliament for the colony's services at Cape Breton and on the intended expedition against Canada. But lesser issues hold an important place, such as the boundary dispute with Massachusetts, illicit trade under flags of truce, the Mohegan difficulty, the proposed appointment of a bishop in America, and the various acts of Parliament that concerned the colonies. The longest document printed is the muster-roll of Col. Williams's regiment, the original of which is among the War Office records in the Public Record Office, and among the most interesting letters are those from Col. Williams himself written to the colony from London. The largest number of letters are those from Gov. Shirley, some sixty in all, none of which are printed in Lincoln's edition of Shirley's *Correspondence,* owing probably to the wish of the Connecticut society to print them itself. There is one proclamation here printed and another referred to that are not included in Brigham's series. As both proclamations are to be found in the *Gentleman's Magazine,* and as Mr. Brigham prints no proclamations for the years from 1744 to 1752, we are led to believe, either that Mr. Brigham did not consider such proclamations as coming within his scope, or that he did not examine this particular source of information. The editor of the volume, Mr. Albert C. Bates, has performed his task in a manner almost impeccable. He might have added perhaps a few more annotations, though in view of the length of the volume and the plan of the series elaborate annotation was manifestly undesirable, and in the list of forts entered in the excellent index he might have inserted the eight references to Fort Number Four.

C. M. A.

Writings of John Quincy Adams. Edited by WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD. Volume IV., 1811–1813. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxv, 541.)

WITH each new volume of the *Writings of John Quincy Adams,* the scope of this important collection of documents becomes clearer and more impressive. A somewhat minute comparison of this fourth volume with the corresponding volume of the *Memoirs* yields convincing proof that the editor has carefully avoided duplication. The formal despatches and even the intimate letters which Adams penned at St. Petersburg in the years 1811, 1812, and 1813, not only add to the detailed records of the diary, but contribute materially to an understanding of the social as well as the political world in which he moved. Adams never allowed himself to record a careless or inaccurate observation in his journal, but he not infrequently omitted, or merely alluded to items of political interest. His formal despatches, on the contrary, are models of punctilious statement. Not a fact or impression which could serve the purposes of his government was suffered to escape. It is not until late in April, 1811, for example, that the *Memoirs* contain any intimation of the approaching rupture between Russia and France; but the despatches to the Secretary of State describe many "symptoms of political alienation" as early as February of that year.

Beside the despatches, which occupy nearly one-half of the volume, there are many lengthy epistles—*letters* seems too slight a word to apply to Adams's correspondence. In writing to members of his family, he relaxed his official austerity somewhat, but he never became spontaneous. Even to his son, for whom he had a deep affection, he wrote in a stilted style which seems addressed quite as much to posterity. On September 1, 1811, he recorded in his diary: "I began this morning the first of a series of letters which I intend to write to my son George upon subjects of serious import." At the close of the first of these letters, he wrote, "I shall number separately these letters that I mean to write you on the subject of the Bible. And as, after they are finished, I shall perhaps ask you to read them all together or to look over them again myself, you must keep them on a separate file. I wish that hereafter they may be useful to your brothers and sister as well as to you."

It was a strange diplomatic world in which Adams moved at St. Petersburg. Few Americans of his day could have played a part in it with his dignity and independence; and even he succumbed at times to the un-American fashions about him. Describing a dinner at the French ambassador's, he wrote, without the slightest approach to humor,

> As my style here is altogether republican, I went only in a chariot and four, attended by two footmen in livery, and driven by a coachman on the carriage box, and a postillion, between boy and man, on the right side horse of the leading pair. My own footmen followed me about

half the way up the stairs, when I threw off and gave them my *shoop*, a large outside fur garment, fit only for wearing in a carriage.

The picture hardly harmonizes with traditional republican simplicity.

Special interest attaches to the despatches in which Adams describes the relation of Russia to the Continental System of Napoleon. The impossibility of a rigid regulation of trade and the community of interests which were drawing Russia and England together, are pointed out in the incisive way of which Adams was master. In a despatch to Secretary James Monroe dated October 16, 1811, there is an illuminating passage (written in cypher in the original) which is worth quoting in full, for the light that it sheds on Russian-American relations.

The Russian commerce of exportation [wrote Adams] is an object of such importance not only to the nation but to the crown and to the nobility who compose the imperial councils and command in the armies that they can never consent to sacrifice it, nor would the sovereign himself, perhaps, be secure upon his throne, should he arrest entirely the circulation which feeds the source of his own revenues and of the private fortunes of all the principal nobility. But Great Britain and the United States are the only markets for this exportation still open, and so long as the peace between them continues, the ships and vessels of the United States provide the means of carriage to England as well as to America. Should, however, the war break out, the exportation to both would become much more difficult. The English being masters of the Baltic would probably not permit the American flag to appear upon it, no neutral vehicle of commerce would be left, and Russia would be reduced to the alternative of sacrificing all her export trade, or of permitting it to be carried by English vessels. The first is obviously the present purpose of France; but I have suggested the causes which render compliance with it here impracticable. The second cannot be done without an avowed and formal peace with England, or at least without precipitating a war with France, which Russia is equally desirous of avoiding. It is this view of things which makes Russia take so much interest in our peace with England; nor is it one of the motives upon which France is so anxious to procure the war. The same view appears to me not less important to the United States themselves, whose policy, if I may be permitted to express an opinion, coincides entirely with that of Russia.

When the belated news of the declaration of war by the United States reached Adams, late in the year 1812, he could see but one great issue involved. "The war hangs upon a single point; and that is *impressment*." And six months later he was of the same mind: impressment was neither more nor less than the crime of "manstealing". "The principle for which we are now struggling is of a higher and more sacred nature than any question about mere taxation can involve. It is the principle of personal liberty and of every social right."

Items of biographical interest abound in this volume. The motives and circumstances which impelled Adams to decline an appointment to

the Supreme Court of the United States, are set forth in his serious way in letters to President Madison and to John Adams. A choice letter, written in Adams's best vein, describes an interview with Madame de Staël. He entered the salon just as the brilliant Frenchwoman was haranguing Lord Cathcart on the glories of the British nation. "To which his Lordship added that their glory was in being a *Moral Nation*, a character which he was sure they would always preserve." "If my mind had been sufficiently at ease to relish anything in the nature of an exhibition", comments Adams grimly, "I should have been much amused at hearing a French woman's celebration of the English for generosity toward other nations, and a lecture upon national morality from the commander of the expedition to Copenhagen."

Long residence abroad did not abate Adams's intense nationalism. On the contrary, it seemed only to emancipate him from the narrow provincialism of his section. He had small patience with the attitude of men like Josiah Quincy who were opposing the admission of Louisiana as a state. That question, to Adams's mind, was settled eight years before. "I love my native land, as much as Mr. Quincy", he wrote, "and I feel an attachment of sentiment to the very spot of my birth which will quit me only with my life. But I could take by the hand as a fellow-citizen a man born on the banks of the Red River or the missouri with just the same cordiality, that I could at least half a million of natives of Massachusetts." One more quotation will suffice to attest Adams's statesmanlike breadth of vision at this time. "I am not displeased to hear that Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana and Louisiana are rapidly peopling with Yankees", he wrote in 1813. "I consider them as an excellent race of people, and as far as I am able to judge I believe that their moral and political character far from degenerating improves by emigration. I have always felt on that account a sort of predilection for those rising western states. . . . There is not upon this globe of earth a spectacle exhibited by man so interesting to my mind or so consolatory to my heart as this metamorphosis of howling deserts into cultivated fields and populous villages which is yearly, daily, hourly, going on by the hands chiefly of New England men in our western states and territories. If New England loses her influence in the councils of the Union it will not be owing to any diminuation of her population occasioned by these emigrations; it will be from the partial, sectarian, or as Hamilton called it *clannish*, spirit which makes so many of her political leaders jealous and envious of the west and of the south."

Allen Johnson.

A Great Peace Maker: the Diary of James Gallatin, Secretary to Albert Gallatin, 1813–1827. With an introduction by Viscount Bryce. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. Pp. xv, 314.)

Certain features in the presentation of this volume are decidedly open to criticism. The text of the diary is obviously not pure. A note on page 51 calls attention to one story that could not have been told on the date under which it occurs, and explains the anachronism by alluding to the fact that the diary, which closes in 1827, was in a bad condition in 1869 and was put in shape by its author, who at that time added notes. Most of these were excluded from publication, but on pages 28 and 61 other aberrations occur without warning. In general, however, the diary bears on its face the evidence of its authenticity. It is surprising to find Viscount Bryce in his introduction speaking of the second Mrs. Albert Gallatin, a member of a well-known Maryland family, which indeed gave Gallatin much the same kind of start in politics as the Schuyler connection gave Hamilton, as "a typical New Englander of that time" (p. x), and not less strange to find him saying of Gallatin that he "resumed the wise financial policy of Alexander Hamilton" (p. ix). He also speaks of the editor as Count Albert, instead of James Gallatin (p. x).

The question of authenticity is of special importance, for the diary is the only available evidence of the fact that the Duke of Wellington wrote to Albert Gallatin during the negotiations of 1814 (pp. 34–55). This is the most important single contribution. A letter of Colonel Barry, describing an interview with Napoleon at Elba, is of some importance, if it has not been printed elsewhere. The other letters and documents included in the volume have been printed in the *Writings* and *Life* of Gallatin, edited and written by Henry Adams. The statement in the diary that Gallatin was nominated for the vice-presidency in 1824 in the hope that in this way he might succeed to the presidency for which his birth disqualified his standing directly (p. 251), suggests several questions.

The diary gains no historical significance from its author, though he interests us as illustrating that an American mother and education could leave him more French than his father. While his brother Albert appears in every line American, and appropriate founder of the American branch of the family, James rejoices at every mile and day of absence from America and becomes founder of a repatriated line. His grandson has cut from the diary "anything that might offend" (p. v), but this does not include that which is supposed to offend the Anglo-Saxon. It is a diary by a young man, and not for the "young person". With this frankness goes an infectious gaiety which gives the diary a unique charm and promises it long life among general readers.

Throughout, against a background of frivolity and social tattle of the *haut monde*, looms the figure of the father of the diarist. No

other material has made Albert Gallatin so living a figure. One realizes how completely he was of the governing class of Europe. Descendant of Jacques Coeur, cousin of Madame de Staël, cousin of Cavour, youthful intimate of Voltaire, he was of a long-enduring stock, of a family which commanded universal entrée. His personality placed him with the elect of this class. The czar, the Duke of Wellington, and Napoleon all gave him signal attention; he could have domesticated himself among the inner circle in any country of Europe. Why did he return to America, where he rightly judged that his career was ended, that worse conditions would ensue before better ones could evolve? Foremost among the reasons was a great and simple love of republican institutions, which shines through all his speech and action. Equally strong, if not more fundamental, was that spirit of loyalty to a task undertaken, to a country voluntarily adopted, inbred in the Swiss, and which had caused Gallatins for centuries to give true service to most of the countries of Europe: the spirit which the Lion of Lucerne commemorates.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

The Winning of the Far West: a History of the Regaining of Texas, of the Mexican War, and the Oregon Question; and of the Successive Additions to the Territory of the United States, within the Continent of America, 1829–1867. By ROBERT MCNUTT MCELROY, Ph.D., Edwards Professor of American History, Princeton University. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1914. Pp. x, 384.)

THIS is a somewhat pretentious book: "It is based", the preface informs us, "upon authoritative, and in part unpublished, sources, and was written at the instance of the publishers, to constitute a continuation of Colonel Roosevelt's *Winning of the West*". To the author it presents a "theme of epic character", and he tells us that the "volume will have failed of its mission if it does not show that the winning of the Far West is an achievement in which every citizen of the Republic may feel an honest pride". Such a purpose and spirit raise an expectation of a literary treatment based upon a fresh handling of materials, together with a doubt concerning the honest pride. One feels at the outset that it may be an epic wherein the gods have staged a play known variously as Manifest Destiny, Benevolent Assimilation, or even as Mommsen's Law. On the last page of the book the doubt is abundantly confirmed. The author closes with the following words: "In looking backward over the process, we cannot fail to see manifest destiny in almost every page . . . it has been a past of which no American need feel ashamed." It is true that so many works treating of this era have been written from this point of view that it was once the traditional method of treating the subject. It is something of a shock, however, to discover, after so many have labored to establish a different

basis, that it should still serve for a serious historical undertaking. Nevertheless its presence reveals more than a page of detailed criticism would do. The author himself gives unconscious comment upon it, for in a foot-note directly below this *envoi* appears an abstract of Andrew Johnson's memorandum concerning the alleged distribution of part of the proceeds of the Alaska Purchase. The egregious Anthony Butler's activities, and Jackson's relations to them, the strange diplomatic perversities of Scott and Trist, the cold-blooded aggression of Polk, and the amazing mission of Gadsden (a story not yet told), of all these we are not exactly proud even if we accept a theory of history-writing in which an appeal to pride is of much importance. Much of this nationalistic expansion, whatever the motives behind it, or the means used to carry it out, was in style frequently called "dashing" or "adventurous", even arrogant, boisterous, and noisy. All of this does not make accurate historical writing easy, but it helps to tell a story. The writer of this volume delights in episodes in which appear old favorites. Jackson, "the battered old (*var.*, "grizzled") war-horse", Sam Houston and Deaf Smith, "his trusty scout", give a *dramatis personae* of the opening act, the Independence of Texas, wherein we are not disappointed to hear that "the bloody avenger has arrived", and herein also, quite properly, out dashes "the horseman flecked with foam from his panting charger". All this, fitted with apocryphal speeches by Houston and English expletives from Santa Anna, serves to revive boyhood memories of Captain Mayne Reid. Fortunately this tone could hardly last throughout the volume, and the manner and style cool greatly in the following chapter, wherein a letter from Lewis to Houston is printed with the meticulousness of the *Documentary History of the Constitution*, unnecessarily carefully, it would seem, considering its intrinsic importance. After such extremes of style a better balance is preserved, and the writer's account of the Mexican War is graphic and readable. Even here, however, one finds some statements which need revision. It is something of an exaggeration to say (p. 151) that the "Rio Grande was filled with the corpses of those who had ventured their lives in one mad effort to stem its turbid current" after Resaca de la Palma.

The bulk of the volume is connected with the events from 1836 to 1848; to the Gadsden Purchase are allotted but two pages and nothing is said about Buchanan's attempts at intervention in Mexico. The concluding chapter is a brief but comprehensive account of the Alaska Purchase. The materials used are wholly American, and nearly all are in print, with the exception of the Ford collection of Jackson letters, of which it is incorrect to say (p. 2) that they "have escaped the notice of historical investigators". Some of the citations are surprising. Why, for example, refer to the *Charleston Mercury* for Poinsett's instructions (p. 8), when they are in the *American State Papers*, or to Chase's *History of the Polk Administration* for the Oregon Notice Resolution (p. 127)? More serious are misstatements of fact or inference. Mon-

roe did not know that more territory could have been obtained in 1819 (p. 4), nor is it correct to say (p. 4) that "Texas was surrendered to obtain Florida", perhaps the author's favorite idea, expressed in the subtitle and insisted upon in the text; Tyler's plan was not "to gain Texas and California by bartering Oregon (p. 118)", and France never claimed Oregon (p. 87), nor does Greenhow, cited as authority, say so. Ashburton's attitude toward Oregon would have been made clearer by reference to his instructions, which are in print. Pakenham's proposal to Calhoun of August 26, 1844, while rejected the same day, was but the beginning of a negotiation lasting for months (p. 123). The proposal to arbitrate the Oregon question had been made by Pakenham as early as January, 1845 (p. 125), and Calhoun's position in February, 1846, was not essentially different from that held by him while Secretary of State (p. 126). Ivan the Terrible reigned from 1533, not 1547 (p. 103), the Russo-American treaty of 1824 was not signed by "John Quincy Adams as President" (p. 106) and the Gadsden Purchase was originally much more than 45,000 miles in extent before the Senate reduced it by amendment (p. 347). But to prolong the list would be to imitate the classical exercises with D'Aubigné and Thiers.

All in all, one's judgment must be that the performance fails to measure up to the hopes aroused by the glowing preface. In so far as the history of American expansion has to do with diplomacy it must be written with constant mindfulness of the maxim *audietur et altera pars*. Until the examination of the Mexican and other archives, now so auspiciously begun, has been completed, we must not expect a definitive history of this important, but assuredly no longer neglected, period. Certainly Mr. McElroy has not brought us nearer the desired goal.

Jesse S. Reeves.

Samuel F. B. Morse: his Letters and Journals. Edited and supplemented by his Son, Edward Lind Morse. Illustrated with Reproductions of his Paintings and with Notes and Diagrams bearing on the Invention of the Telegram. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xxi, 440; xvi, 548.)

This book is in reality a life of Morse, written by his son, Edward Lind Morse. The story is told in great part through extracts from letters and selections from journals, but narrative, at first merely supplementary and explanatory, becomes more frequent and important as the work progresses, and in the later periods when Morse had become a figure of international importance, it is the dominant feature.

The career of Morse is of two quite distinct and very different parts. In volume I. we have the beginnings—in middle life—of a painter; in the second volume the beginnings—in middle life—the struggles, and the final triumph of an inventor. In the earlier letters there is much

about Benjamin West and Washington Allston, and we get glimpses of Copley, and later of Thorwaldsen, Horace Vernet, and Turner; but there is little evidence, either during Morse's three years (1812–1815) as an art student in London, or during the later period (1830–1833) which he spent in painting in the Louvre and in the Italian galleries, of any profound impression made upon his mind by the great masters, or of any susceptibility to the artistic atmosphere of the time.

And yet Morse had undoubtedly unusual aptitude for painting. Within a year of his arrival in London he received a gold medal from the Society of Arts. His *Dying Hercules,* exhibited at the Royal Academy while he was still an art student, and the strength of the composition of many of his later portraits which are admirably reproduced in these pages, rather than anything he says about art, seem to justify the confidence which he frequently expressed in his early days but never finally realized, that he had in him the making of a great painter.

During his two earlier visits to Europe Morse made many interesting acquaintances, and the names, if too often little more, of Lamb, Coleridge, Samuel Rogers, Washington Irving, Fenimore Cooper, Wilberforce, Abernethy, Lafayette, Alexander von Humboldt, and other famous men of the times, appear in his letters.

The War of 1812, which began and ended during his first residence in London, is the subject of much comment, and the letters of that period are of particular interest at the present time. On page 92 (vol. I.), for example, Morse recounts a conversation with Henry Thornton, M.P., in which Thornton stated that the British object in the Orders in Council was the *Universal monopoly of commerce,* but that America ought to have considered the circumstances of the case, and that *Great Britain was fighting for the liberties of the world.*

It would be hard to find a parallel to Morse's experience in 1832. He set sail for home an American artist of middle age returning from a prolonged stay in the European galleries and full of plans for the painting of future masterpieces. He landed in New York the inventor of the telegraph, and entered forthwith into a new, strenuous, and wholly unpremeditated career.

The decade ending in 1843 with the appropriation by Congress of the funds with which to build the experimental line between Washington and Baltimore, and with Morse's triumphant demonstration of the practicability of his system, is the most appealing and dramatic period of his life. Throughout these ten long years he struggled ceaselessly and with singlemindedness, amid increasing poverty due to the necessary neglect of his only means of subsistence, to develop his invention and to prove its usefulness. The subsequent period of long-continued and bitter litigation to establish his rights and to secure his interests, and even the final years of prosperity during which fame, honor, and international recognition were his, lack the intense interest of that time of stress and desperate endeavor.

As a portrait of the man this work is admirable; and although not free from a certain bias which is natural enough when we consider that the author is a son of the personage described, it is doubtless essentially accurate. The pervading strain of Puritan piety and a certain simplicity of nature, which were among Morse's most striking characteristics, are amply displayed.

It is not surprising, perhaps, that there should be even less of electricity in the account of Morse the inventor than of art in that of Morse the painter. All that pertains to art is regarded as literature; all except the vaguest generalities concerning science is deemed mere technical "shop". To the reader of these pages it will nevertheless be clear that the transition which occurred in 1832 was not from art to science, but from art to invention. Although Morse brought with him to America Daguerre's great discovery and through it came into touch with one of the keenest and most fertile minds of the time, it was Draper who first applied photography to research, while Morse used it in the making of portraits. Although from his work upon the telegraph came acquaintance with Joseph Henry and with his great achievements in electricity, the connection led to no scientific results.

To the fact that Morse was neither a man of science like Draper or Henry, nor an inventor of the usual type, but a large-minded, intensely patriotic Yankee of the sort not uncommon in his day, was probably due his great success. His dream, which he tried in vain to make a reality, was to turn the telegraph over to the government of his country for the use of its citizens forever; his vision was always of the great benefit to humanity which was to come from his labors.

E. L. Nichols.

Reconstruction in North Carolina. By J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, Ph.D., Alumni Professor of History, University of North Carolina. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, vol. LVIII., no. 141.] (New York: Columbia University. 1914. Pp. 683.)

Professor Hamilton's volume has a double value. As a study of the process of reconstruction within a state, it illustrates the principal usefulness of research in the local field—the visualization of the character and results of national policies. The book is also the only comprehensive survey of the history of North Carolina from 1860 to 1876, in fact it is the most extensive single contribution to any period of the state's history. A distinguishing feature is the transition of interest back and forth from matters of primarily local importance to those of more national interest.

One of the author's conclusions is that if the Congressional plan of reconstruction had not been applied, North Carolina would to-day, "so

far as one can estimate human probabilities, be solidly Republican". Evidence for this conclusion is the analysis of political history from 1850 to 1867, which is given in the first four chapters. The theme is the decline of the Whig party after 1850, the rise of a radical type of democracy and of the sentiment favorable to secession, the return of Whig leadership with the Vance administration during the war, and the continued supremacy of the Whigs "who had no thought of joining in politics their old opponents the Democrats", in the elections under the Johnsonian plan of restoration. Such an interpretation from such evidence is not to be rejected, but the reader is not guarded against inferring some wrong deductions, while certain details of significance are unduly emphasized, and others are omitted. Thus one should not conclude that all of the North Carolina Whigs were deeply attached to the Union or that secession was entirely the work of the Democracy. As a matter of fact in the legislative debates over slavery extension in the session of 1850, a set of radical states' rights resolutions was introduced by a prominent Whig and conservative Democrats and Whigs co-operated in their defeat. Moreover, the defection of Clingman, who leaned toward secession, is not mentioned. Division within the party over the slavery issue which is not mentioned, as well as the manhood suffrage issue raised by the Democrats, which is related, was a cause of the decline of whiggery in North Carolina. Nor is the record of Whig leadership from its revival in the election of 1862 complete. It is rather singular that a considerable number of former Whigs drifted into the peace movement. Among these was Worth, the treasurer of the state, who wrote resolutions for local meetings in the interest of peace. (See *Correspondence of Jonathan Worth,* vol. I., *passim.*) The management of the state finances during the war was not in all respects wise and conservative. As the writer points out, the actual bond and note issues were not so great as were authorized, but there is no mention of the unwise management of the securities of the Literary Fund and the Sinking Fund. Likewise, the financial policy from the close of the war to the opening of the radical régime is not clarified; some measures were the exchange of railway bonds for unproductive stock, the final wreckage of the Literary Fund, the abolition of the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and making local taxation for school purposes optional. These facts should warn us against considering the record of the North Carolina Whigs as one of efficiency or unity. Therefore, supposing that the Whig element should have gone over to the Republican party in 1867, as the author suggests, might there not have been considerable opposition to it?

With chapter V. interest veers to national, rather than local, politics. It gives an admirable analysis of military administration under the Reconstruction Acts. Other chapters on the Union League and the Freedmen's Bureau likewise visualize the reaction of national politics on local conditions. When however the theme again reverts to affairs primarily

local, the treatment is not so satisfactory. The details of extravagance and corruption are well marshalled, likewise the rise of the Ku Klux, Holden's use of force, and the resulting impeachment. But the frequent use of oral tradition as authoritative, the continual reliance on the leading conservative newspaper, whose editor was probably mentally deranged, and a warm sympathy with the struggle for redemption from radical misrule, leave the impression that mercy is never offered the reconstructionists and that in some cases extenuating circumstances are not duly considered. A distinct contribution to knowledge of the period after 1868 is the revelation of the cleavage within the Republican party and the use of federal patronage especially in the elections of 1872.

A singular omission among the sources for the period is the Johnson manuscripts in the Library of Congress, which are illuminating for affairs in North Carolina from 1865 to 1867. There is no bibliography and the map is misleading with respect to railway lines in operation in 1865. The style is superior to that of the average work of its class, riveting attention to matters of minor as well as of major importance.

Wm. K. Boyd.

The Anthracite Coal Combination in the United States: with some Account of the Early Development of the Anthracite Industry. By Eliot Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Economics, State University of Iowa. [Harvard Economic Studies, vol. XI.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xiii, 261.)

Is there an anthracite coal "combination"? In his selection of a title for his book, Dr. Jones assumes that there is; and in his preface he says: "This combination controlling the anthracite coal trade is found to be a combination of railroads, owning either directly, or indirectly through subsidiary coal companies, substantially the entire area of the anthracite coal deposits of the United States."

This charge of "a *general combination* to control the anthracite coal industry", said the Supreme Court, deciding the government's anti-trust suit against the Reading Company and other anthracite railroads, is "the theory upon which the bill is framed and upon which the case has been presented" (United States *v.* Reading Company, 226 U. S. 324, 343, 1912). The Supreme Court in this case held that this charge was not established. Absence of "*documentary* evidence of solidarity", which Dr. Jones implies was the determining fact, was really only one of the considerations. "We have gone through the record", said the Supreme Court (*ibid.*, p. 346). "The acts and transactions which the bill avers to have been committed by some of the defendants in furtherance of the illegal plan and scheme of a general combination" (*ibid.*, p. 371) and which, the Supreme Court decided, did not establish any such *general combination,* are variously characterized by Dr. Jones

as "persistent efforts . . . to restrict or eliminate competition" and as "the development of an effective combination". This was the view which the government had urged upon the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, however, held otherwise. "The accomplishment of these several subordinate transactions", said the Supreme Court, "only completed one or another of the several groups of carriers and coal-producing companies, which several groups were thereafter not only possessed of the power to compete with every other group, but, as we have already seen, were actually engaged in competing, one with another, prior to the general combination through the Temple Iron Company and the sixty-five per cent. contract scheme" (*ibid.*, p. 372). To similar purpose were the remarks of the court on the agreement of 1896, on the absorption of the New York, Susquehanna, and Western Railroad by the Erie, and on the acquisition of the Central Railroad of New Jersey by the Reading Company.

The only transactions which the Supreme Court found to support the charge of a *general combination* were the Temple Iron Company acquisitions and the sixty-five per cent. contracts. Dr. Jones's discussion of these is excellent. With the sale of the Temple Iron Company's property, however, and the cancellation of the sixty-five per cent. contracts, pursuant to the decree of the court, there remained, according to the Supreme Court, no general combination controlling the anthracite coal trade, such as Dr. Jones assumes; but, at the worst, only "several groups of carriers and coal-producing companies", each of which may or may not offend against the Sherman Act—the Supreme Court expressly left this point undecided—but which were all independent of each other and "were not steps or acts in furtherance of any general scheme" and were "not only possessed of the power to compete with every other group, but . . . were actually engaged in competing, one with another". These independent "groups of carriers and coal-producing companies" all apparently resumed this status after the sale of the Temple Iron Company's property and the cancellation of the sixty-five per cent. contracts.

The problem, therefore, is not that of a "combination controlling the anthracite coal trade"; nor is the government endeavoring, as Dr. Jones concludes, "to effect the dissolution of the anthracite coal combination". The problem is the relation of carrier, coal-producing company, and coal-selling company within each of several independent groups; and the government is now endeavoring, so far as possible, to disintegrate still further each group and each party in each group. Very scantily Dr. Jones has indicated the practical economic grounds on which the separate groups are now resisting further disintegration. That these grounds are substantial appears from the fact that upon them the government has lost every case thus far tried (United States *v.* Delaware L. and W. R. Co., 213 Fed. 240, D. C. N. J., 1914; United States *v.* Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, D. C. S. D. N. Y., 1915, not yet reported).

That these grounds are less technical and more practical, and that the parties in these separate groups are acting in better faith than Dr. Jones thinks, is clear from the reasoning of all the decisions thus far rendered in these latest government suits.

GILBERT HOLLAND MONTAGUE.

MINOR NOTICES

La Confederazione Achea. Per Giovanni Niccolini. [Biblioteca degli Studi Storici, I.] (Pavia, Mattei e Compagnia, 1914, pp. xii, 348.) Niccolini's *La Confederazione Achea,* a recent contribution to the study of the Hellenistic period of Greek history, had been foreshadowed by a series of monographs appearing since 1908 in the *Studi Storici per la Antichità Classica,* which have to a certain degree laid the foundations for this present work.

In his introduction the author justifies his choice of the word "confederacy" rather than "league" on the ground that the former implies an alliance creating a new political organism, with its own magistrates and assemblies, and more closely corresponds to the Polybian συμπολιτεία, whereas the latter more accurately translates συμμαχία. The introduction likewise contains a brief critical estimate of the sources for the history of the Confederacy, with special attention to the chief authority, Polybius. The political history of the Achaians from 280 to 146 B. C. is traced in the five opening chapters, throughout which special stress is laid upon Achaio-Macedonian and Achaio-Roman relations. Due prominence is given to the careers of Aratus and Philopoemen. It was the former who brought Sicyon into the Confederacy (251), thereby changing the character of the union and giving it the first impetus to expansion beyond the ethnic unity of the Achaians. To Aratus also, whom Niccolini holds to have been poisoned by Philip V. in 213, is given the credit for having founded the greatness of the Confederacy and indicated how it should be preserved. Philopoemen strove to repair the military weakness of the Achaians, remove the special privileges of cities, break up the larger states into smaller units, and maintain a dignified attitude towards Rome. With an almost Thucydidean concentration on purely political activities, Niccolini attempts no moral judgments, considering results more essential than means, and thus fails to give as complete a characterization of Aratus as appears, *e. g.* in Tarn's *Antigonus Gonatas,* a book which, although of importance for Achaio-Macedonian history from 280 to 240, he ignores. The sixth chapter deals with the federal constitution and the organs of the central authority, the finances and military organization, as well as the rights of the individual communities within the Confederacy. The concluding chapter is devoted to a study of the chronology from 280 to 146, determining the relation of the Achaian to the Olympic year in Polybius and, as far as possible, the dates of the Achaian *strategoi,* of whom a tabu-

lar list is added. Considerable space is occupied here with a discussion of the date of the battle of Sellasia (221), the death of Philopoemen (182), and the events of 146 B. C.

In an appendix, "La Grecia Provincia", the view is sustained that Greece was not made a province in 146, and its political status is followed down to the time of Augustus. An index of proper names closes the book. There is no bibliography, but the foot-notes show a thorough acquaintance with the modern literature in this field. Although Niccolini throughout has to traverse ground already covered by Freeman, Beloch, Niese, or Swoboda, nowhere does he depend solely upon secondary sources but at all times displays independence of judgment and critical ability.

A. E. R. Boak.

The Life of Saint Severinus by Eugippius. Translated into English for the first time with Notes by George W. Robinson. [Harvard Translations.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. 141.) It is to be regretted that there is no large series of English translations of medieval sources similar to the German *Geschichtschreiber*. Such a collection would be of the greatest service to teachers and all general readers who do not use the originals. Robinson's *Life of Saint Severinus by Eugippius* is an excellent example of a type of scholarly work which, if attempted by other students of the Middle Ages, would do much to increase the popularity of their field.

The interesting biography of Eugippius, which presents such a vivid description of the life in a Roman province as it was being overrun by barbarians, is put into most readable English. The translation is accurate and preserves the spirit of the original. A brief preface contains references to secondary works for the aid of the reader. The appendix contains a list of the editions and translations of this source, a Latin hymn in praise of the saint, and a chronological table. It is a matter for regret that the translator did not include an introduction. The foot-notes reveal careful study, but fail to give much information of an explanatory character which would have been extremely useful to the English reader.

In general the translation has profited by being literal. *Noricum ripense* very happily becomes "Riverside Noricum". In a few cases the translation adheres too closely to the original. *Per ducenta ferme milia* is rightly "for about two hundred miles" (p. 82) but Rodenburg thinks this distance too great and reduces it to twelve miles (*Geschichtschreiber,* IV. 57, note 1). "Wherefore aid thyself rather than the poor from those things which thou yet thinkest to keep, while Christ hungers" (p. 34) preserves the obscurity of the original Latin.

In conclusion, it may be said that the translation is entirely reliable and deserving of confidence. Mr. Robinson has set an excellent standard for translators.

Frederic Duncalf.

Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien. Von Harry Bresslau. Zweiter Band, Zweite Auflage. (Leipzig, Veit und Comp., 1915, pp. x, 392.) The new edition of Bresslau's *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre* (see this REVIEW, XVIII. 158) plans to devote two volumes to the subjects covered in the single volume of the original edition. The second installment, forming the first part of volume II., comprises chapters X.–XV., treating of the language of medieval documents and the various preliminaries and stages through which they reached their final form. This part of the manual shows the qualities of wide learning, sound judgment, and broad historical outlook which characterize all the author's work and show him to be always an historian as well as a specialist in diplomatics. The progress of investigation compels fuller treatment of many questions, such as the petitions of the papal chancery and the problems connected with the relation of draft to final form; indeed the process of revision has increased the bulk of the work by one-half. Some of the topics, such as the history of formularies and the use of Latin and the vernacular in charters, are of more than technical interest. We miss a discussion of the formularies of the papal penitentiary, respecting which our information is in many respects more satisfactory than in the case of the formularies of the chancery, the earliest of them being accessible in print in the *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary* edited by the late Henry C. Lea in 1892. As this was probably composed by the well-known Thomas of Capua, it should be connected with his *Summa dictaminis* and grouped chronologically with the earliest formulary of petitions (*1226–1227*), which Bresslau duly mentions, and the extensive "Forme Romane curie super beneficiis et questionibus", likewise of the period of Gregory IX., which precedes the formulary of the penitentiary in Lea's manuscript and still awaits study.

The remaining portion of the text will, the author hopes, begin printing "as soon as peace is restored". So doth diplomatics still wait upon diplomacy!

C. H. H.

Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries. Edited by F. E. Harmer, B.A. (Cambridge, University Press, 1914, pp. x, 142.) Miss Harmer's book belongs to an important series of studies that have been inspired and in part directed by Professor H. Munro Chadwick of Cambridge University, whose interest appears to lie in the borderland between philology and history. Except for a few documents included in Napier and Stevenson's *Crawford Collection of Charters* there is no satisfactory edition of the Old English "land books". Miss Harmer has undertaken to edit a small number of selected charters and has chosen twenty-three documents all of which are in the Anglo-Saxon language. The greater number are land charters, but the editor has also included wills, one manumission, and "dedicatory inscriptions" from two manuscript copies of the Gospels. Miss Har-

mer has attempted to do three things: to give accurate texts; to provide English translations; and to prepare a body of critical notes. She has added an appendix in which she discusses differences in dialect and has prepared a very satisfactory index of persons, places, and objects. A comparison of Miss Harmer's texts with those of earlier editions shows that she has been able to obtain far more accurate versions than those of Kemble or Birch. But to students of history the most important part of her work is her notes, in which she clears up a number of disputed points, though many still remain in the field of conjecture. She has also corrected a number of errors in the dates assigned to these documents by earlier editors. In a prefatory note Professor Chadwick pronounces all the documents genuine with one possible exception; one is therefore surprised to find that the editor has failed to indicate that this may be a forgery but discusses it as if its genuineness were beyond dispute.

L. M. L.

Bartolus on the Conflict of Laws. Translated into English by Joseph Henry Beale, Royall Professor of Law in Harvard University. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Oxford, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. 86.) This book is commemorative of the six-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Bartolus, one of the most famous of the many great Italian lawyers of the Middle Ages, and the first writer to put in a standard and authoritative form the doctrines of the Conflict of Laws. Bartolus does not use this expression as a title, nor does his treatment of the subject constitute a treatise in itself, strictly speaking. One portion (*De Summa Trinitati*) of his lengthy Commentary on the Code is devoted to a consideration of the opposing legal customs in the different Italian city states. In this is discussed the extent to which laws have effect in cases touching events or things outside the territory of the individual state, and the law properly applicable to particular cases involving foreigners or the property of foreigners. It is this part of the text of Bartolus which, with the omission of a few sections, Professor Beale has translated.

No attempt has been made to preserve either the rather complicated form or the technical language of the original. Indeed, the translation is singularly free from technical expressions, which is certainly a point in its favor even though it "has purposely been made freely, with the hope of making the work in this way clearer to American lawyers". The frequent references to the Code, Digest, and *Speculum Juris* which occur in the body of the Latin text, in the translation appear, with some omissions, in a simplified form as foot-notes, the passages themselves being extended and translated and put in an appendix. This has been done for the purpose of distinctly separating the work of Bartolus from that of his predecessors. Short biographical notices of those earlier lawyers whose opinions Bartolus expressly cites are to be found in the foot-notes. A bibliography of the printed Commentary on the Code

is given in the introduction. The book is strictly what it professes to be, a translation, and does not go beyond that.

G. E. W.

The Financing of the Hundred Years' War, 1337–1360. By Schuyler B. Terry. [London School of Economics, Studies in Economics and Political Science, no. 35.] (London, the School, 1914, pp. xx, 197). Dr. Terry has undertaken the difficult task of unravelling the tangled history of the financial transactions of the English government during the early years of the Hundred Years' War. He has traced in detail the loans made by foreign and domestic merchants, Italian, Hanse, Flemish, and English, and has described the alternating periods of financial strength and weakness of these groups. He has also brought together much information concerning the value of the wool-trade as a source of revenue.

Unfortunately, errors due to hasty proof-reading and errors of fact are all too frequent. On page 24 the following were found. The Bardi were not given on June 9 "a small assignment of £410 on Nottingham", for in the writ referred to it is stated that they had been paid that sum by certain collectors of the tenth and fifteenth granted by the Parliament meeting at Nottingham. The loans amounted to £12,205 17*s.* 5*d.*, not to £12,305 7*s.* 10*d.* "Some London merchants" should read, "a London merchant". The order of June 26 had reference to all the tin of Cornwall and Devon in the hands of certain royal commissioners and not to "all the tin in Cornwall". It is hardly correct to state that the king "issued orders for the investigation of a silver mine in Ireland", since the order was issued to the treasurer of Ireland to provide "wages . . . and other things necessary" for certain miners and others who were being sent to seek for silver mines and to make money there. The king leased lands to William de la Pole for ten, not sixteen years, and his payment was hardly a loan. Similar errors appear throughout chapter II., which was examined in detail, and were found on isolated pages elsewhere selected at random.

Throughout the study there appears a lack of knowledge of the significance of the entries upon the receipt rolls. The statements of the income of the crown (*e. g.*, pp. 141–142, 158–159, 164, 182–183) are based upon the erroneous idea that these rolls contain an accurate description of the royal income during any one year. Owing to the use of tallies of assignment they do not give such information. The term *mutuum* is treated as though it always refers to actual loans, whereas it frequently refers to fictitious loans, the latter being a device of the period used to avoid undue complication of bookkeeping. (See, on these matters, Society of Antiquaries, London, *Archaeologia*, LXII. 367 ff., and *Proceedings*, second series, XXV. 29 ff.) Compilations of statistics based upon such erroneous readings of the records have little value.

James F. Willard.

Archivo General de Simancas: Catálogo IV., Secretaría de Estado (Capitulaciones con Francia y Negociaciones Diplomáticas de los Embajadores de España en aquella Corte, seguido de una Serie Cronológica de éstos). Por Julián Paz, Jefe del Archivo General de Simancas. I., 1265–1714. (Madrid, Junta para Ampliación de Estudios é Investigaciones Científicas, Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1914, pp. xii, 902.) In accordance with the decree of February 2, 1810, designed to centralize in Paris the archives of the various states allied with or subjected to the French Empire, the archives of Simancas were, in October, 1810, started on their journey across the Pyrenees. In 1816 the greater part of them made the return journey, but by some chance there remained in Paris the legajos of diplomatic correspondence with France for 1265–1714, and despite frequent representations on the part of the Spanish government these are to this day in the Hôtel Soubise, where as part of the Archives Nationales they are catalogued as *K, 1385–1711*, although popularly known as the Archives de Simancas. Until the present volume the principal printed description of this material was the six-column inventory—if it may be called that—of the *État Sommaire*. It is therefore a very real service that Señor Paz has been able to render as a result of his four years' mission in Paris at the behest of the Centro de Estudios Históricos. The plan and scope of the catalogue are, it would seem, the best calculated to serve the largest number of interests. A complete calendar of the documents would have involved the publication of many volumes. In the present work the carton is treated as the unit and its contents are described in one or (generally) more pages. The arrangement of the material, which covers mainly the years 1400–1700, is as follows: 1. Treaties and negotiations. 2. Despatches and instructions of the kings of Spain to their ambassadors in France. 3. Opinions of the Council of State on the correspondence of the ambassadors and agents in France. 4. Despatches from the ambassadors of Spain in France. 5. Aragon and Franche-Comté. 6. Miscellaneous. By way of an appendix is added about one hundred pages of notices on the Spanish ambassadors, and the indexes, one of persons, one of geographical names, one of subjects, and a chronological index—all very complete.

Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk. Door P. J. Blok. Tweede Druk. Tweede Deel. (Leiden, Sijthoff, 1914, pp. 694.) This second volume of the second edition of Professor Blok's standard work takes the place of the third and fourth volumes of the original edition, published in 1896 and in 1899 respectively. It runs from the departure of Philip II. in 1559 and the regency of Margaret of Parma to the death of Prince Frederick Henry in 1648 and the treaties of Westphalia; its period is thus the most interesting and important part of Dutch history, that of the Eighty Years' War and the stadholderates of William the Silent and his two sons. Since the corresponding parts of the first

edition were published, Professor Pirenne has published the fourth volume of his masterly *Histoire de Belgique,* Marx's *Studien zur Geschichte des Niederländischen Aufstandes* and Rachfahl's *Wilhelm von Oranien* have appeared, and a multitude of monographs and articles, Dutch, Belgian, and German, on the political, military, diplomatic, religious, economic, and social history of this brilliant period in the life of the Netherlands. These Professor Blok has utilized to the full in the revision of his text, carried out in the most painstaking manner, and leaving it by far the chief history of his nation.

Willem Usselinx. Door Catharina Ligtenberg. (Utrecht, A. Oosthoek, 1914, pp. 237, cxxxiii.) Willem Usselinx, though an interesting character, and invested with a certain additional interest for readers of American history by reason of having been the founder of the Dutch and of the Swedish West India Company, was not a figure of the first importance, and Dr. Jameson's elaborate biography published in 1887 sufficed for American readers. But that was twenty-eight years ago, and in the meantime several important Dutch and other monographs on the commercial history of that period have appeared, such as Bothe's *Gustav Adolfs und seines Kanzlers Wirthschaftspolitische Absichten auf Deutschland,* van Brakel's *Hollandsche Handelscompagnieën,* Lannoy and Vander Linden's *Expansion Coloniale,* vol. II., and Dr. Amandus Johnson's *Swedish Settlements on the Delaware.* A young Dutchwoman, candidate for the doctor's degree at Utrecht, might very well think there was use, for Dutch readers, of a new biography. She has used the same material as Dr. Jameson, printed and manuscript, from Dutch and Swedish archives, and not much more. She has a better grasp of the economic aspects of her subject, but otherwise the story is necessarily much the same. Students in either country will thank her for her appendix. Van Rees having printed, in the appendix to volume II. of his *Geschiedenis der Staathuishoudkunde,* several of the principal memorials of Usselinx to the States General preserved in the Dutch archives, she prints in hers, from the Swedish archives, nearly thirty letters of Usselinx to the Chancellor Oxenstjerna; also two late memorials of 1645 to the States General. There is a portrait of Usselinx, from the painting discovered about 1890, and a facsimile of a page from one of his memorials.

The English Factories in India, 1646–1650: a Calendar of Documents in the India Office, Westminster. By William Foster, C. I. E. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914, pp. xxxii, 362.) The admirable quality of this series both as to content and editorial supervision has already received notice in previous issues of this Review. This eighth volume is no exception; and derives special value because the original documents drawn from the Bombay Record Office, which were calendared for this volume, were lost at sea on the return voyage to India. Fortunately however a

verbatim transcript had been made in England, so the loss was not entire. In addition to this material the volume contains documents in the India Office Archives drawn from the Original Correspondence series, the Factory or Marine series, and the Letter-Books.

On the whole the chief subjects treated in this period do not show any very novel or distinctive features as compared with those treated and previously noted for other periods. But the emphasis shifts somewhat. Thus the English rivalry with the Dutch enters on another stage with the peace of Münster in 1648. This treaty won from Spain a final recognition of Dutch claims to freedom of trade in the East; and renewed activity by the Dutch caused the English some anxiety. But in 1649 the English wished to avoid a "personall warr with the Dutch, for which wee have neither warrant from the Company nor meanes to maintaine it with any reputacion to our nation or safety to their estates" (p. 236). A second matter is the endeavor of the English to develop the trade with Burma, particularly in Pegu and Ava. This attempt emphasizes again the continued importance of trade between Asiatic ports carried on by the English in competition not only with other Europeans but also with natives. On the whole, in spite of the usual and frequent complaints as to hardships and "miserie", internal conditions were by no means as difficult as in previous years. One reason undoubtedly was the profitable character of this local commerce. This was fortunate, for, in view of the state of affairs in England, the amount of capital available from home was not great or constant. Still matters were better than during the height of the Civil War. Events in England receive small comment; but the news of the execution of Charles I. aroused the fear lest by Indian princes "it wilbe deem'd so haynos a matter of such high nature (they not knowinge more then that our King is kild) that they will not only accompt of us your servants and nacion contemptable unworthy people, but retract" (p. 269) some of the English trading privileges. Indeed, though disorder in India was endemic, the contrast with troubled England "would not be unreservedly in favour of England" (p. vi). Above all in this volume the great variety of economic interests involved and the steady way in which they were continuing and developing give in unsensational but sturdy form the evidence of an increasingly firm foundation for English influence and ambition.

Alfred L. P. Dennis.

British Radicalism, 1791–1797. By Walter Phelps Hall. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, vol. XLIX., no. 1, whole no. 122.] (New York, Columbia University, 1912, pp. 262.) Dr. Hall tells us in his preface that his original purpose was to "describe the political organization of radicalism", but, finding "organized radicalism . . . inconsequential and abortive", he concluded to give his chief attention to

"an analysis of radical theory". He divided his monograph into two sections, entitled respectively, Radicalism in Theory and Radicalism in Practice. In the first section he asserts that "radicalism was born in October, 1790", that being the date of the publication of Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution.* Burke's pamphlet, in the opinion of Dr. Hall, became the "hammer and anvil" by which the radicalism of the future was wrought out; the older radicalism "became suddenly a side issue" (p. 46). From this starting point Dr. Hall proceeds first to summarize the views of Burke, Hannah More, and Reeves, the exponents of conservatism, and then in turn of Price, Priestley, Tooke, and Cartwright, whom he terms "the older radicals", and finally of Wollstonecraft, Paine, Mackintosh, Bentham, Godwin, Spence, Gerrald, Frend, Barlow, and Thelwall, whom he regards as the real exponents of the radicalism of that period. In the second section of the monograph the author gives an account of the origin and character of the various societies organized in that period to promote reform and of the so-called British Convention, concluding with a description of the measures adopted by the government to suppress the activities of these organizations. As regards this last subject, Dr. Hall concludes that the government had good grounds for its action, since a considerable element among the reformers meditated radical changes in the existing social order even at the cost of an "armed insurrection".

There is space here to mention only two of many criticisms to which Dr. Hall's monograph is liable. He leaves the impression that radicalism in England had a far more sudden birth than a perusal of the works of earlier political writers would probably convince him that it had. And there could be little stronger evidence of the fact that there was no considerable party among the English reformers of the period he has studied who meditated insurrection than the paucity of the testimony which Dr. Hall offers in support of the opposite contention.

William Thomas Laprade.

The Life of Captain Matthew Flinders, R. N. By Ernest Scott, Professor of History in the University of Melbourne. (Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1914, pp. xviii, 492.) This book is undoubtedly a useful contribution to the history of the maritime exploration of Australasia. Captain Flinders entered the British navy in 1789 and died in 1814. His only experience of warfare was in 1794 in the battle off Brest; and he was a prisoner of the French during the long years 1803–1810 at the Île de France. His services as a discoverer which stimulated the writing of this book are therefore confined to about a dozen years, a period recorded in a little more than half the book. As an addition to the general history of such an important age or as an inspiriting biography of an intrepid explorer the book leaves us cold; and to a certain degree it lacks both balance and skillful background though there is at times considerable digression.

But the author has searched records both printed and manuscript and observes an admirable technique. The illustrations are interesting and the maps of Flinders's voyages are indispensable. In the appendixes are an excellent bibliography and a long list of names given by Flinders to important Australian coastal features, which in itself is evidence of his great work. Furthermore are two documents of French origin: one is Baudin's account of the meeting of the French and English exploring expeditions in 1802, and the second is the lengthy report of Port Jackson of Péron, the French spy, to General Decaen at the Île de France. In this connection Professor Scott rejects for lack of evidence the idea that Napoleon was concerned with schemes for French expansion in Australia. However, one can gain more or less accurate information as to the condition of English interests from the French sources rather than from the compressed maritime data of the English officers. For as a whole the records and life of Flinders are surprisingly lacking in information as to both native and colonial life. He was a sailor who stuck close to his ship, and for this reason the book has comparatively small value for the history of early English settlement.

On the other hand stand the positive results achieved at great risk. For in 1791–1793 in the South Pacific under Bligh, young Flinders fed his growing passion to visit the blank spaces on the map. Between 1795 and 1800 came the exploration of Bass Strait and the more detailed cruises along the shores of New South Wales and Queensland, to be followed by the circumnavigation of Tasmania. These adventurous endeavors were but preliminary to the greater voyages along the southern coast of Australia and finally the circumnavigation of the island continent by 1803. Fortunately Flinders was an author as well as a sailor and his own record of this voyage was published in 1814. It is rare that the first man to know the confines of a region should also have the chance to give its enduring name, for Australia comes from Flinders's insistent adoption; and with the centennial of his death numerous local memorials of his work have been set up to perpetuate his name and work.

Alfred L. P. Dennis.

The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas. By Arthur Cushman McGiffert. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1915, pp. x, 315.) The scope of Dr. McGiffert's account of the rise of distinctively modern religious ideas is fixed by the plan of the series which it initiates (*Works on Modern Theology*, general editor, J. M. Whiton, Ph.D.). It is not intended as an adequate history of the modern movement of thought but as a summary statement of the influences promoting such a movement. After a preliminary account of the disintegration of Protestant scholastic theology by the influence of Pietism, Rationalism, Natural Science, and the Critical Philosophy, the work explains the more recent reconstruction of theology by the aid of modern philosophical and historical conceptions. This undertaking is happily accomplished by an author who can give con-

cise and lucid expression to the thought of eminent thinkers and can clearly define the manner in which new currents of thought transform the theological inheritance. Certain chapters are of especial value in defining and discriminating important conceptions (Divine Immanence, Ethical Theism) and the excellent chapter on the Rehabilitation of Faith gives just consideration to Jacobi, Fries, DeWette, thinkers now after long neglect restored to our attention.

Given the enforced brevity of these neat elucidations, one may commend their clearness and accuracy. Possibly there is here and there a too sharp formulation of ideas in the case of thinkers who had not achieved a perfect consistency. It is, for example, not quite safe to say that for Martineau God was immanent in nature but not in man. There is, in fact, opportunity for a critical examination of Martineau's utterances to bring his thought on this matter to a more exact form, as, in general, for the production of a real history of the modern movement a prior work of detailed specialized investigation is needed.

This comment may be applied in particular to the chapter on the modern movement for a practical Christianizing of the social order in place of the old complacent almsgiving as a source of merit for the individual seeking to earn his reward. After considering the birth of humanitarian enthusiasm at the end of the eighteenth century, Dr. McGiffert passes to the propaganda of Owen, St. Simon, Fourier, the English Christian Socialists, and the influence of Marx. Such a brief outline leaves an erroneous impression as to the sources and personal leaders of the new social spirit within the religious body. An adequate account would emphasize very different personalities, the Wilberforce circle in England, the current symbolized by Wichern and von Bodelschwingh in Germany, and Channing in America. These are names that indicate an inner movement within the religious sphere acting by the spontaneity of religious motive and not simply yielding to the foreign pressure of economic theories.

Dr. McGiffert's exposition fails to give due recognition to the part of America in adopting, expressing, enforcing these modern religious ideas of transforming effect. Channing, Emerson, Parker, Father Hecker are names not to be left in the shadow of Europe. These were men who influenced the world abroad as well as at home—only they do not figure in the pattern German accounts which are apt to reduce the vogue and social activity of ideas to the rise and fall of university dignitaries.

But a sufficient spiritual history of the time since Lessing is a task of the future and Dr. McGiffert's work is an excellent and stimulating pledge of it.

F. A. Christie.

Treitschke: his Doctrine of German Destiny and of International Relations: together with a Study of his Life and Work. By Adolf Hausrath. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914, pp. xi, 332.)

Professor Hausrath's allusive essay on his intimate friend's life is really a series of personal reminiscences and reflections and not at all a biography. The author has given—and this is the chief value of the essay —only what he knew from personal experience. We have, therefore, nothing of Treitschke's life before the Freiburg period, and relatively little about the all-important Berlin period. The essay is also valuable because of the numerous details regarding many minor German reformers, and concerning the political and publicistic activities of German professors in general. The essays of Treitschke translated include those on the army, international law, German colonization, Germany and neutral states, Austria and the German Empire, the alliance between Russia and Prussia, and freedom. Unfortunately, they are not the best-known essays, those most important for historians, nor those most characteristic. They seem to have been selected with a view to the interest of the general public in current issues. It is perhaps as well, for the translation is villainously bad. Not only is it partially ungrammatical, but it seems to be the work of some German with a very inadequate knowledge of English idiom. Some of the sentences are unintelligible, and in many cases it is evident that the meaning of the passage has escaped the translator, who has rendered the words without understanding what they meant. Quotation marks are omitted; titles of books are translated as if part of the text; some titles are translated several times in different ways, all of them wrong. The book is the result of haste and misdirected enterprise.

ROLAND G. USHER.

Mr. Chamberlain's Speeches. Edited by Charles W. Boyd, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Austen Chamberlain, M.P. In two volumes. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. xxiii, 372; viii, 393.) Doubtless one of the most effective factors in Mr. Chamberlain's power as a political leader was the self-confident finality with which he treated all subjects of practical importance. Moreover, only practical issues interested him. Speculative problems and those requiring balanced treatment were beyond the pale. These qualities, so serviceable for the leadership of the popular elements to which he chiefly appealed, are abundantly evident in these two volumes of speeches. Among other anomalies in Mr. Chamberlain's career, this attitude accounts for the singular conviction, indicated in so many of his speeches, that notwithstanding the many changes of front which, in the course of his career, had carried him from extreme radicalism to high toryism, he had maintained a substantially unaltered political creed. Under this conviction, apparently held with considerable sincerity, he seemed to see Radicals like Roebuck lose the spirit of progress and become reactionaries; and Liberals with whom he had long associated, become typical Tories stolidly protecting their vested interests. But, strangest of all, he sees the bitterest of his former enemies, the land-monopolizing, food-taxing Tory peers, who had trembled with

mingled fear and indignation at his "doctrine of ransom", becoming true Liberals and even philanthropic Radicals, and thus brought into harmony with himself, who, alone of all English political leaders, had remained true to the standards of his youth. As the editor of the speeches puts it in essaying the somewhat difficult task of supporting his chief in these assumptions, "His development involved no change of principle" (I. xv).

The attitude of the editor indicates the basis on which the selection of speeches has been made, and the spirit in which the introductory and connecting comments have been framed. The very effort to minimize the striking contrasts, not to say flat contradictions, in Mr. Chamberlain's numerous changes of attitude, betrays at once the chief object in view and the difficulty of accomplishing it. For the ordinary reader, not particularly interested in the full significance of Mr. Chamberlain's unique career or in the ultimate fate of the problems dealt with, this is perhaps of minor importance. The collection certainly contains very fair samples of Mr. Chamberlain's method of appeal, line of argument, and style of oratory. It indicates also the wide range of his interests. Here we have samples of the appeals connected with his early and notably successful efforts at municipal reform in his native city of Birmingham. There are a few lighter touches connected with the celebrated "Caucus", that most thoroughgoing example of Tammany organization, but employed, originally at least, for purely beneficent objects. As President of the Board of Trade in Gladstone's cabinet, we find him an uncompromising free trader demonstrating that even moderate protection, tariff retaliation, and that chief iniquity of Tory land-monopolizing peers, the tax on food, would destroy the trade and impoverish the laborers of England. Yet later we find him as the leader of tariff reform and Tory imperialism, equally certain that without a protective system of tariff retaliation and taxes on food the trade and commerce of Britain are doomed, and the empire abandoned to destruction (II. 157). Naturally, home rule for Ireland and the South African War are duly represented. Nevertheless, the student who would understand the full sweep of Mr. Chamberlain's views must supplement the present collection with many other, and often more typical, samples of his speeches.

ADAM SHORTT.

The Origins of the War. By J. Holland Rose, Litt.D., Fellow of Christ's College and Reader in Modern History, University of Cambridge. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1915, pp. 201.) This book is disappointing. Mr. J. Holland Rose is an historian of sufficiently established reputation for the reader to have a right to expect from his pen something much more serious and judicial than the mass of ordinary publications on the war with which we have been flooded for the last six months. What is more, Mr. Rose is on his own ground, for he has already done excellent work on the history of Europe during the

last forty years and has shown himself, if not an unprejudiced, at least a fair-minded judge of recent events. This time, however, he has given us a volume that will not add to his laurels. He can only fall back on the excuse of the patriotic excitement under which he has labored. He is not declamatory or abusive, and he knows much more about his topic than most of the writers who have dealt with it, but at bottom it is nothing but one more partizan appeal. Germany is the villain of the story; Great Britain the kindly, if thick-witted hero. To be sure Mr. Rose gives chapter and verse of some kind for most of his statements from a large range of authorities from Bismarck down to Armgaard Karl Graves, apparently not realizing that the mere fact of citing such a writer as the last named, shakes our confidence in his own judgment. We are told certain things were "probably" true. We learn that "an authority has informed me", and that on another occasion Mr. Rose was "informed by a diplomat", and later still and more specifically that a lady friend of his repeated to him indiscreet utterances gathered by her from the redoubtable General von Bernhardi at an Italian pension. He also attaches much weight to, and puts in an appendix, a melodramatic quotation from a newspaper article by the Special Commission of the *Transvaal Chronicle*, which describes the nefarious designs of the Germans in South Africa in the autumn of 1912. All things considered it does not seem worth while to enter here into a general discussion of Mr. Rose's views or to question the accuracy of his details. The book has been dashed off quickly under the sharp stress of recent events and his lapses are probably due to haste, as well as to lack of coolness. On his last page, feeling perhaps that he has been a little hard on the Germans, and wishing to show that he bears them no permanent ill-will, he makes a suggestion that will hardly be popular in the United States.

> The fiat of mankind will, I hope, go forth that they shall acquire, if need be, parts of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and South Brazil. America will realize that the world cannot forever bow down to the Monroe Doctrine, especially as the United States have become a colonising Power, but that parts of South America may safely be thrown open to systematic colonisation by a nation like Germany.

The Scotch-Irish in America. By Henry Jones Ford, Professor of Politics, Princeton University. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, London, Oxford University Press, 1915, pp. viii, 607.) It is no great praise to say that Professor Ford's book is the best of the books upon its subject. Hanna's is in respect to facts an undigested farrago, and in respect to doctrine an uncritical paean. Bolton's rests on real study, but treats only a small portion of the field, and is greatly lacking in sequence of thought and orderliness of narration. Professor Ford seems to have made some thorough first-hand investigations into the history of the Plantation of Ulster and into some other portions of his large field, though he gives few references to original sources of information.

Moreover, though his book is not that of a man experienced in historical work, it is that of a skilled student of political science, who has a penetrating insight into Irish conditions, and that of a logical thinker, who can distinguish, for instance, between the direct origin of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and the incoming of the Presbyterian theory of church polity, or of the Puritan spirit, into our colonies. The book is clearly and well written, and covers in fair proportion the history of seventeenth-century Ulster (in which he somewhat exaggerates the Scottish element), that of the migrations to America, that of the Scotch-Irish settlements in Pennsylvania, New England, and elsewhere, that of the influence of Presbyterianism on education, and that of its influence on the Revolution. While Mr. Ford is far from that vice of "claiming everything" with which the Scotch-Irish Congresses have made us so familiar, there is surely some exaggeration in such dicta as the following, from his final chapter: "It was not until after the extensive infusion of Scotch-Irish blood that New England developed traits since regarded as characteristic" (p. 524); "This rapidity of national expansion [1775–1832] is a direct consequence of Scotch-Irish immigration and is unaccountable until that factor is considered" (p. 529); "The rapid rise of manufactures in the first part of the nineteenth century was a development prepared mainly through Scotch-Irish enterprise" (p. 530); and, "To this day the American school system has a Scottish stamp" (p. 533). The appendixes present, among other things, some pages from Fynes Moryson's *Itinerary* and an ethnographical lecture on "The Making of the Ulster Scot", by Professor James Heron of Belfast. A map of Ulster would have been a useful addition.

Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1659/60–1693. Edited by H. R. McIlwaine. (Richmond, Virginia, 1914, pp. lxxii, 529.) In 1680, under orders from the Committee of the Privy Council for Trade and Foreign Plantations, the practice began of sending journals of the House of Burgesses to England, where the series is preserved in the Public Record Office. With that year begins therefore a new era in the history of those journals. The journals of previous sessions were evidently composed with less care, and also but very few of them have been preserved. It would have been distinctly better if Dr. McIlwaine had begun this his twelfth volume with this year, 1680. The materials for the preceding twenty years, filling the first 118 pages of his text, are of a character quite different from that of his regular series of journals, but entirely like what he will have to use for the period from 1619 to 1659, so that a volume for 1619–1679 would have been homogeneous. He has still further impaired the uniformity of the present volume by omitting all prefaces to the 1659–1679 matter, while the prefaces relative to the sessions from 1680 to 1693 have the character which previous volumes have led us to expect.

Most of the period from 1659 to 1679 is occupied by Berkeley's long-

lived General Assembly of 1661–1676, corresponding to the Cavalier Parliament in England. For the sessions of these twenty years we have only three or four sporadic journals, the sets of orders passed at nearly a score of other sessions, and a miscellaneous aggregation of other legislative documents, not pretending to completeness. Some of these materials come from Hening, but most are derived from the originals in the Public Record Office or the transcripts therefrom possessed by the commonwealth of Virginia. Those of 1677 are useful toward the understanding of Bacon's Rebellion.

Passing to the more satisfactory materials for the period 1680–1693, we note that resort has been had to the copies in the Public Record Office for the texts of all. Yet in 1891 the writer read in the Virginia State Library the original journal of the session of March, 1693. Has it since disappeared?

The period from 1680 to the end of 1693 (Culpeper, Chicheley, Howard of Effingham, Nicholson, Andros, governors or deputy-governors) is marked by eight assemblies and eleven sessions. For two sessions no journals are known; the editor supplies their places with analogous documents. Upon the history of the other sessions the journals cast a flood of light. Dr. McIlwaine much increases their value by his skillful and learned introductions. It is a pleasure to learn that, when one more volume has finished the journals of the Burgesses, he hopes to begin a similar series of journals of the Council; he has abundantly earned and richly deserved the privilege.

Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675–1690. Edited by Charles M. Andrews, Ph.D., L.H.D., Farnam Professor of American History, Yale University. [Original Narratives of Early American History.] (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915, pp. ix, 414.) This volume contains the narratives of five insurrections which took place in the English-American colonies between 1676 and 1689. Two of these uprisings broke out in the middle of the reign of Charles II., while the others were consequent upon the expulsion of James II. Professor Andrews shows that nevertheless they all were "manifestations of a general discontent in the larger English world and the result of fears which prevailed in England as well as America". This discontent was directed primarily against the system of government attempted by the Stuarts alike in England and the colonies. Except in New England, and certainly not even there during the last years of the Andros administration, there was no free government: "the royal or proprietary appointees controlled affairs and often compelled the popular assemblies to follow their lead".

Contrary to the opinions of Doyle and Fiske, Professor Andrews holds that there was no desire for separation from England. Nor was the commercial system a moving cause for discontent. It is true that the New Englanders complained of Randolph and the Albemarle people of Miller because of their attempts to collect the duties, but both Randolph and Miller were hated for other reasons, and in the narratives here

printed complaint against the navigation laws hardly figures. In fact Professor Beer has shown (*Old Colonial System,* II. 143) that in the two hundred articles of complaint, published by the sympathizers with Bacon, commercial restrictions are mentioned but three times. And with reason, for until 1696 the acts were very inadequately enforced.

A suggestive point brought out in these narratives is the mutual dependence of the colonies. Not that there was any idea of union, as has been suggested in the case of Bacon's Rebellion, but it is evident that the leaders of the insurrections were in communication with their sympathizers in other colonies. Attention is called to the large part played by the New England sea-captains in promoting this intercolonial sympathy.

Three accounts of Bacon's Rebellion are given: the narrative by Thomas Matthew, which is the one most frequently quoted; the report of the royal commissioners; and an anonymous account, probably contemporary. This last is the most interesting of the three, although extremely biassed against Bacon. The difficulties of the texts and the numerous allusions are made clear by excellent notes. It might have been helpful, however, even at the expense of some of the biographical material, to have printed some of the documents referred to.

Briefer accounts are given of the uprisings in North Carolina and Maryland, while three long narratives are given of Leisler's rebellion in New York. These last well illustrate Professor Andrews's point: that the insurrections were the result of discontent with the system of government—in New York complicated with party, class, and race dissensions—rather than that they were movements for independence or revolts against the commercial system. It is interesting to note that Professor Andrews has been unable to discover any trace of a commission to Ingoldsby which would have justified Leisler's surrender of the fort.

The expulsion of Andros is told in eight narratives. One of these, the letter of Captain George, of the *Rose*, to Pepys, has not hitherto been printed. In his discussion of the events Professor Andrews agrees with those who see in Andros not a tyrant, but an "imperious and impatient" administrator who enforced English law rather than colonial customs.

Taken together these sixteen narratives most satisfactorily describe the insurrections in the colonies, while the introductions and notes give the critical interpretations generally accepted by the most modern scholarship.

EVERETT KIMBALL.

Money and Transportation in Maryland, 1720–1765. By Clarence P. Gould, Ph.D., Mitchell O. Fischer Professor of History, University of Wooster. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series XXXIII., no. 1.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1915, pp. 176.) This study is the second installment of what its author purposes to make "a complete economic history of Maryland" between

the years 1720 and 1765. The first, being a study of the land system, appeared in 1913; the third, to be a study of the agricultural system, is begun. By far the greater part of this, the second of the series, is devoted to an account of the uses of coins, bills of exchange, tobacco, and paper currency—the principal kinds of money in colonial Maryland. Coins—gold, silver, and copper—were scarce, and so many of them were clipped and cut that they circulated mostly by weight. Bills of exchange were used primarily in the trade with England, and many Maryland bills were procured by merchants of Philadelphia and New York for use in that trade. Tobacco, the money most in use, is shown to have been decidedly unfit for the purpose prior to the passage of the inspection act of 1747. Of the paper currency, Dr. Gould cautiously affirms that "it is hardly too much to say that this was the most successful paper money issued by any of the colonies". The concluding chapter contains an account of the roads, ferries, means of conveyance by land and water, public inns, and postal service.

Dr. Gould has gathered his material from many sources and found the Callister Manuscripts in the Maryland Diocesan Library especially helpful, but he seems to have used the large body of unpublished Calvert Papers only with a very imperfect calendar as a guide. With more careful proof-reading, he would not have allowed the transposition of lines on page 53.

N. D. M.

Western North Carolina: a History (from 1730 to 1913). By John Preston Arthur. [Published by the Edward Buncombe Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Asheville, N. C.] (Raleigh, N. C., Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1914, pp. 710.) The western portion of North Carolina, perhaps because of its geographical isolation, has been little studied by annalist and historian. In his *Historical Sketches* (1851) Wheeler employed the county as the unit of chapter division and gave ill-digested summaries of the chief events in the history of each county—a strange jumble of civil records, military incidents, and biographical sketches. As evidence of the need for a history of this section, may be cited the significant fact that separate histories in book form of only two of the counties studied by Mr. Arthur have as yet been printed (Haywood and Macon). This book is the pioneer in the study of North Carolina by geographical sections—a branch of study recently signalized by the appearance of Sprunt's *Cape Fear Chronicles* and Albertson's *In Ancient Albemarle*.

Mr. Arthur's chief claim to attention is due to the patient and intimate study of the people, their life, customs, and traditions, which this book abundantly exhibits. There are many errors in spelling and typography, and a few as to fact—such as placing the treaty of Fort Stanwix in 1767 (p. 67), giving John B. as the name of one of the sons of Daniel and Rebecca (Bryan) Boone (p. 87), and omitting mention of Richard Henderson's visit to the Otari towns in company with Nathaniel Hart

in 1774 (p. 86). The author is trustworthy in the citation of sources; but he relies almost slavishly upon a few works from which he quotes frequently and at excessive length—McGee's little *History of Tennessee,* Roosevelt's *Winning of the West,* Thwaites's *Daniel Boone,* Draper's *King's Mountain and its Heroes.* The brevity of the printed bibliography indicates the real deficiency in printed sources from which the book suffers. The bibliography is conspicuous for the omission of Summers's *Southwest Virginia,* Ashe's *North Carolina,* Haywood's *Tennessee,* Phelan's *Tennessee,* Putnam's *Middle Tennessee,* Smyth's *Tour,* and Hunter's *Sketches of Western North Carolina*; nor has the author enjoyed the benefit of Ashe's two essays on the State of Franklin (*North Carolina Review*), William Blount's "Vindication", and Battle's sketches of incorporated schools and academies (*Report* of State Supt. of Public Institution, 1896–1897). Just credit is due the author for his exhaustive personal rediscovery of the Boone Trail; and he has made adequate use of the hitherto unpublished diary of John Strother (*cf.* p. 38 *et seq.*). The chapter on "Roads, Stage Coaches, and Taverns" is very incomplete: forgotten trails are traced, while some of the most important printed sources with respect to early highways have not been examined.

Mr. Arthur has most painstakingly quarried out a great mass of materials, which remain for the most part uncut boulders. Such talent as he displays is accumulative rather than integrative. Facts of the most trivial character elbow concerns of grave political and social moment. While not deficient in insight into the character, the predilections, and the prejudices, of the "mountain people", the author has little sense of historical perspective. The western section is treated as isolate, self-contained—unrelated in any large way to North Carolina as a whole. The book is chiefly valuable as a work of ready reference; the contents of six hundred and fifty pages is easily mastered through the aid of the excellent fifty-page index.

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

The Illinois-Wabash Land Company Manuscript. With an Introduction by Clarence Walworth Alvord. (Chicago, privately printed by Cyrus H. McCormick, 1915, pp. 22, facsimile pp. 40.) The documents reproduced in facsimile in this volume relate to attempts of a group of land speculators to secure a grant of land on the Illinois and Wabash rivers in the years from 1772 to 1775. The four documents included are the opinion of Lords Camden and Yorke respecting the sovereignty of an Indian nation, the treaty with the Illinois Indians in 1773 in which land was granted to the Illinois Land Company, the treaty negotiated by Louis Viviat in 1775 with the Piankashaw and Wea tribes for land on the Wabash River, and the Articles of Agreement uniting the Illinois and Wabash companies. The facsimile is preceded by an introduction portraying the background, which enables the reader to understand the period with which the documents are associated. The first document,

and one of the most important, the opinion of Lords Camden and Yorke, was rendered in 1769 and was probably given at the instance of Samuel Wharton, the representative of a firm of Pennsylvania merchants who were seeking a grant of land from the government. Its significance lies in the assertion that individuals could purchase land directly from the Indian tribes and that titles thus secured would be considered valid by the English courts. The British government had hitherto taken the position, in the proclamation of 1763, that western expansion should be slow and only after Indian titles had been purchased by representatives of the crown. It was to take advantage of this opinion that the Illinois and Wabash companies sought to secure title to large tracts in the Illinois and Wabash countries. Their efforts were effectually checked, however, by the rigorous enforcement of the government's policy as outlined in the royal edict. The volume is a model from the standpoint of workmanship. The printing is well done and the reproduction of the documents is excellent. The scope of the work precluded bibliographical apparatus and critical notes.

Calendar of the Correspondence of George Washington, Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, with the Officers. Prepared from the original manuscripts in the Library of Congress by John C. Fitzpatrick, Division of Manuscripts. Four volumes. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1915, pp. vi, 1–802, 803–1634, 1635–2460, 2461–2865.) In 1906 the Library of Congress issued a *Calendar of the Correspondence of George Washington with the Continental Congress,* in one volume, which included the correspondence of Washington with the President of Congress, with committees, and with individual members of Congress. The present calendar (which is No. 2 of the calendars of the Washington manuscripts and prepared by the same hand) is rather broader in scope than its title would indicate, for it includes not only Washington's correspondence with military and naval officers of every rank of the continental and state troops and with French auxiliaries, but also his correspondence with foreign ministers and agents and with British officers. On the other hand, his correspondence with the governors and civil authorities of the states (another important part of the Washington Papers) has not been included.

The basis of the calendar, which properly begins with Washington's assumption of command in June, 1775, and closes with his resignation of his commission in December, 1783 (a few papers of later date have been included for the sake of completeness), is the series of drafts of Washington's letters, although several other series of manuscripts have been drawn upon.

The plan of the calendar is the same as that of the previous volume and is sufficiently familiar to require no elucidation. One question concerning enclosures may, however, be raised: When a letter is an enclosure the calendar so records it, but it does not show what enclosures

any given letter contained. This information is often of importance and can be obtained only with difficulty, if at all, after the letter and its enclosures have been separated, inasmuch as the writers often give but uncertain clues to the enclosures. The location of printed texts is confined to Ford's and Sparks's editions of Washington's *Writings* and Sparks's *Letters to Washington.*

The index, which occupies the whole of volume IV. (pp. 2461–2865), is in large measure analytical, but it must be understood that any such compressed analysis is necessarily imperfect. It is helpful but not absolute. One feature of the index volume calls for especial commendation. A schedule of pages grouped in periods of six months, which is repeated at the foot of each two opposite pages of the index, enables the searcher to determine at a glance the approximate chronological place of any given reference.

Deficiencies in the execution of such a calendar as this can be discovered only after putting it to prolonged and manifold uses, but it may safely be presumed that these volumes will be found to have been done with the same accuracy and thoroughness that characterized Mr. Fitzpatrick's first calendar of the series. A small list of errata has been recorded in the last volume, but one typographical error which was overlooked may be a little puzzling if not confusing until the error shall be discovered. In the first paragraph on page v ("Sources and References") "Designation A" should be "Designation B".

Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association for the Year 1913–1914. Vol. VII. Edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh. (Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the Torch Press, 1914, pp. 398.) The volume contains the proceedings of the association at the mid-year meeting held at Columbia, South Carolina, December 31, 1913, and at the seventh annual meeting held at Grand Forks, North Dakota, May 26–28, 1914, and also the papers read at the annual meeting. Those read at Columbia have been printed elsewhere. Of the twenty-seven papers printed in this volume only a few can be considered in this brief notice.

Professor James A. James, in a study of "Some Phases of the History of the Northwest, 1783–1786", presents effectively some of the salient features of western history during the three years following the establishment of peace, particularly the negotiations with the Indians, by which title to the West should be quieted, including a discussion of the British policy and attitude in regard to the Northwest, both before and after the peace.

In a paper upon a related theme, "American Opinions regarding the West, 1778–1783", Professor Paul C. Phillips discusses in an interesting manner personal and sectional attitudes toward the West, particularly as set forth in the reports of the French ministers to Vergennes. To be really adequate, of course, such a discussion should take account more largely of firsthand expressions, many of which are available. It

should be remarked that there was no delegate in Congress from Virginia named "Matthews". John Mathews of South Carolina is probably meant.

In a paper entitled "Stephen A. Douglas and the Split in the Democratic Party" Professor O. M. Dickerson offers a forceful argument in opposition to the somewhat stereotyped opinion that Lincoln by his adroit questions at Freeport forced Douglas into admissions that culminated in the split in the Democratic party.

Passing mention should be made of Mr. Logan Esarey's account of the organization of the Jacksonian party in Indiana, a valuable chapter in the history of Jacksonian politics; of Mr. Doane Robinson's account of the recent finding of a Verendrye plate at Fort Pierre, South Dakota, and discussion of the Verendrye explorations; of Mr. Warren Upham's paper on the explorations and surveys of the Minnesota and Red Rivers; and of Mr. Chester Martin's story of the Hudson's Bay Company's monopoly of the fur-trade at the Red River settlement, 1821–1850. Of especial interest is Professor Clarence W. Alvord's "Critical Analysis of the Work of Reuben Gold Thwaites".

Life in America One Hundred Years Ago. By Gaillard Hunt, Litt.D., LL.D. (New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1914, pp. xi, 398.) The completion of one hundred years of peace between the United States and Great Britain quite naturally awakened interest in the conditions of life existing in America at the time of the treaty of Ghent. It is this event which accounts for the appearance of Dr. Hunt's sketch. The principal value of the volume is that its atmosphere is that of 1815, about which date it centres its diversified information. Its material is of the type made perfectly familiar for the colonial period by Mrs. Earle and many other writers, so that neither the plan of the study nor its resultant description of men, manners, or modes lays any claim to originality. In many ways the attractive volume of nearly three hundred pages is like a scrap-book. For it is filled with memoranda of much significance covering a wide variation in subjects. The arrangement of the material is more or less arbitrary.

Peace brought with it a new epoch with new men in charge of affairs and with a spirit of intense Americanism everywhere dominant. While Dr. Hunt notes the absence of national land-hunger in 1815 and indicates the presence of a quite sharply defined sectional feeling, he senses the accepted belief of the people occupying the eighteen states and four territories that the United States is bound to be a great nation.

In this new epoch the individual American had his life confined in rather narrow bounds. He travelled little, largely because there were no facilities or inducements for travel. He wrote few letters because of limited acquaintance and the expense of carriage of letters. If he had any education he acquired it in the institutions near his own home. Every feature of his life was such as might be expected under such nar-

rowing influences. These influences had their natural effect on his dress, his occupations, his reading, his religious views, and the breadth of his outlook upon the larger problems of human society.

Dr. Hunt has used to good advantage his gleanings during his long study of the political life of this period and so enriches his volume with many detailed descriptions of American characteristics so far as travel, education, costume, play, humor, superstition, philanthropy, and religion are concerned.

Apart from the notable simplicity of the life of the time the most marked characteristic of the people appears to be the intensity of their patriotic devotion to country. The faith in the future of the nation was attended by an attachment to the soil and by a fondness for the word American which is noted in almost every walk of life where there is any occasion for utilizing the word.

Dr. Hunt gives a valuable bibliographical section, in which suggestions for added material are grouped under the separate headings which he has followed in his narrative. The volume is a sprightly and readable one, admirably adapted to its special centennial purpose, and certain to make strong appeal to all interested in the development of a people's social life.

The Scandinavian Element in the United States. By Kendric Charles Babcock, Ph.D., Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Illinois. [University of Illinois Bulletin, vol. XII., no. 7.] (Urbana, University of Illinois, 1914, pp. 223.) The effect of immigration upon American character and institutions is to-day attracting, and properly attracting, an ever-increasing attention. The philosopher with his stars and the sociologist with his compass have of late been forecasting confident but divergent futures. To the pedestrian mind it is a relief to find that the historian is not so dilatory as he sometimes is in his less ambitious task of laying firm, by laborious engineering, the road from the past to the present. Experience seems to show that the first preliminary must be the careful and detailed study of the several racial elements, and Dean Babcock contributes a substantial block to this course of the construction.

While not as comprehensive a work as the study of the *German Element* by Dr. A. B. Faust, his monograph is somewhat sounder in quality. In fact, for the subjects and period that it covers, it is a model of historical workmanship. The text is clear and brief, but gives evidence of a wide knowledge of detail and a deep understanding of relationship. The critical essay on materials (pp. 183–204) is not needed to give authority to the text, but will serve as the recognized starting point of all further studies in the field. Two things seem to be so well done as not to require reworking. The history of the process by which the emigration movement extended through the Scandinavian countries (pp. 21–65), while it may be expanded, and has indeed been given in more de-

tail, can scarcely be improved. The study of the development of the self-governing instinct under the conditions of frontier life (pp. 140–156) deserves to become a classic. The tendencies of the Scandinavians to migrate in families, to settle in groups, and to vote the Republican ticket, are made plain. The relative weight of party and race in politics, the desire for political distinction and its attainment, and the economic conditions under which the immigrants established themselves, all receive due attention. The reviewer, however, believes that the author somewhat underrates (p. 181) the feeling between Swede and Norwegian caused by the separation of the kingdoms in 1906.

On the other hand, the treatment of the European background is scant, and the study of the social characteristics and tendencies of the Scandinavians is too dependent upon statistics. This is particularly true of the chapter on religion (pp. 106–129), where an admirable opportunity of revealing the quality of the Scandinavian mind is lost. The same indisposition to depart from concrete facts probably explains the writing of a book on the Scandinavian element in the United States without mention of Ibsen. Or if the influence of Ibsen is too intangible, the same certainly cannot be said of Swedenborg, whose philosophy connects so concretely with American thought. Of course, the purpose of Professor Babcock is to treat of Scandinavians materially present in the United States, but, to the non-Scandinavian American, the mind of that nation is most familiar by its manifestations in the national literature, and the historian of migration should certainly discuss the relation of the emigrants to such familiar ideals and points of view.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

Applied History. Edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh. Volume II. [Iowa Applied History Series.] (Iowa City, the State Historical Society of Iowa, 1914, pp. xx, 689.) "Applied History" is the Iowa designation of what Professor Robinson calls the "New History". For an historical society to decide that it will not be a mausoleum of books, that it will be forward-looking, is a truly remarkable fact and a hopeful one. The Iowa Historical Society made this decision when it planned its work so that its historical research will function in the social legislative programme of the state that supports it. This action might very well and profitably be imitated by university departments of history. For the plan Professor Shambaugh deserves the congratulations of all persons interested in the improvement of social legislation and public administration.

Professor Shambaugh conceives three steps necessary to scientific law-making—for it is this, in his mind, which is the justification of the series. These are: (1) the collection and indexing of data, *i. e.*, legislative reference work; (2) careful sifting of materials, a critical analysis of data, a scientific interpretation of facts, *i. e.*, scientific research; and (3) the expert drafting of bills. The *Applied History* series supplies the middle term of this trio. In the introduction to the first volume Pro-

fessor Shambaugh has defined its *point of view*. He says that the law of the continuity of history "affords substantial assurance that Applied History is not a dream but a sound and intelligent method of interrogating the past in the light of the conditions of the present and the obvious needs of the immediate future to the end that a rational program of progress may be outlined and followed in legislation and administration". *Its field* is the political, economic, and social history of Iowa. *Its method* may be defined briefly as the method of scientific historical research. So much is admirable.

The book is made up of a series of articles by different persons, dealing successively with the following subjects: reorganization of state government, home rule, direct legislation, equal suffrage, selection of public officials, removal of public officials, the merit system, social legislation, child labor and poor relief legislation. In every case the scope of the study is limited in its title to "in Iowa", though of course reference is frequently made to other places.

From the viewpoint of the American Historical Review the first comment to make is that the essays of the volume are not in their primary intention historical. Brief superficial historical reviews of the subjects treated are given in practically all the papers. But the promise of the definition of "applied history" is not fulfilled in any of them. We expected a kind of natural history of the movements listed: of how in the light of their experience, or in spite of it, the people of Iowa progressed, or evolved their political, economic, social present status; and how, profiting vicariously from the experience of others, a new social programme was being evolved in the light of the history of local institutions. Such a promise is not fulfilled.

The essays are not contributions to knowledge from a scholarly viewpoint. Most of the references in all but one or two of the essays are to secondary authorities. Most of the authors in their prefaces say that their effort is to define the problems they are treating. The papers are admittedly not "exhaustive" treatment but give simply a "general view". As such they are very useful and helpful documents.

In type, paper, binding—in every mechanical detail the volume is excellent.

Edward A. Fitzpatrick.

History of Education in Iowa. By Clarence Ray Aurner. In two volumes. (Iowa City, the State Historical Society of Iowa, 1914, pp. xiv, 436, ix, 469.) These two handsome volumes, which really deal only with elementary education in Iowa, constitute the first third of an ambitious work to be devoted to the history of education in that commonwealth. The five parts of the first volume are given up to: general historical introduction, the public school funds, school districts, teachers in the schools, and text-books in the schools; the second volume treats in well-proportioned chapters of school supervision, state boards, teachers' institutes, teachers' associations, industrial training, parochial schools, etc.

The notes and references are massed at the end of each volume, and attest the author's thorough-going and minute knowledge of state and local legislation from the territorial period to the present; of reports of officials, commissions, and associations; and of the ups and downs of public sentiment from the days of the "School Killers" who opposed taxation for free schools, to the era of free text-books and evening schools for adults. The important part played by the State Teachers' Association, during its sixty years of activity, is well brought out in part IV. of the second volume.

So rigidly has the author held to his purpose to deal here only with the lower reaches of education that he seems at times to be oblivious of the interplay of such forces as came from racial or social antecedents of Iowa's population, economic conditions, early colleges and the state university, and religious sentiment. Neither the historical nor the geological writer can afford to study in its isolation the stratum upon which he is working; a General Historical Introduction (part I.) to a history of education of a state ought not to deal with common schools alone.

The careful analysis of state laws and the summarizing of state educational reports are among the best features of these volumes; they reveal the methods of an experienced and appreciative student. The massing of details occasionally lacks discrimination and emphasis and results in padded paragraphs and pages. Not even infinitesimal historical interest attaches to the fact that in the Burlington schools in 1853 "playing in the school building or rude and noisy play upon the grounds was expressly forbidden" (I. 25); nor is it necessary to give a half-page of text, with exact statistics of twenty-two years, to show that the number of women holding the office of county superintendent rose from one in 1870 to fifty-nine in 1913 (II. 89).

The usefulness of these two volumes, taken as a whole, and telling as they do the story of the normal development of the elementary schools of what might be called a typical state of the Middle West, prompts the hope that they may be followed by others at an early day. At least one state will then have a survey of the past and a full cross-section view of the present of its educational system and administration prepared and set forth in a clear and straightforward style by a single investigator.

K. C. Babcock.

The Fall of Canada: a Chapter in the History of the Seven Years' War. By George M. Wrong, Professor of History, University of Toronto. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914, pp. 272.) This volume deals with what may well be termed the critical year of Canadian history—the twelve months intervening between Montcalm's defeat on the Plains of Abraham in September, 1759, and the surrender of Montreal in September, 1760. It has been too often taken for granted that the Battle of the Plains settled things so far as French dominion in Canada was concerned. Professor Wrong has now shown conclusively how far the facts are from giving ground for any such notion. The hold which the

English maintained upon Quebec during the entire winter of 1759–1760 was most precarious. A little more vigor on the part of Lévis after the encounter at Ste. Foy would have demolished the entire results of Wolfe's patience and strategy. But Murray managed, in spite of great difficulties, to hold his grip until the English command of the seas turned the balance decisively in his favor.

Through most of the nineteenth century students of history were left to believe that a brilliant coup of the imagination was the chief factor in winning Canada for Great Britain. Parkman's great writings only strengthened this impression. But Dr. Doughty and Lieut.-Col. Wood have more recently demonstrated that without Vaudreuil's meddlesome incompetence the strategy of Wolfe's landing would never have had a gambler's chance of success. And now Professor Wrong brings proof that even with Quebec in British hands the conquest was not half assured. The army which Montcalm commanded on the Plains managed to get away from Wolfe's regiments and was promptly joined by nearly three thousand men under Bougainville. The French, in the winter of 1759–1760, had ten thousand men with whom to attack the city on its undefended side. General Murray, within the walls, had only half that number fit for duty. No wonder that he tried to draw the French into making a truce for the winter.

The author tells his story well. This does not imply, however, that the book is superficial. On the contrary, it goes more thoroughly into the events of its brief period than any previous volume has gone. Details drawn from a great variety of sources are woven together into an interesting narrative, with no attempt to plead the cause of any personage or theory.

The only feature of the volume meriting a word of serious criticism is the map which comes at the end. Surely Professor Wrong is not responsible for the weird cartography which places Lake Nipissing due north of Lake Superior, sets Lexington on the Merrimac, and locates the land of the Senecas down in Pennsylvania! The publishers must have included it as an afterthought.

William Bennett Munro.

COMMUNICATION

To the Managing Editor of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

SIR: The reviewer of my book, *Russian Expansion on the Pacific,* in the April number of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XX. 627, charges me with erroneously estimating the distances between certain places named. I am willing to confess that the statement regarding the distance "across Holy Cross Bay" is erroneous. But the distances mentioned on page 78 are derived, and are there stated to be derived, from a letter from the United States Hydrographic Office, dated October 1, 1909, which is textually quoted in foot-note 177, on page 78. That foot-note reads:

> Information obtained from the United States Hydrographic Office, October 1, 1909:
>
> "Replying to your letter of September 22, 1909, in regard to the distance in nautical miles from Koluima River to the Anaduir River following the windings of the coast, the following information is furnished:
>
> "Koluima River to East Cape ..... 1115 miles
> "East Cape to Anaduir River ..... 1045 miles
> Total ..... 2160 miles"

As it is of some historical importance to know what the actual distances in question are, I call attention to the fact that the Hydrographic Office has in this letter testified, as it was requested by me to testify, as to the distances *following the windings of the coast.* My object in asking the Hydrographic Office for the information in this form was to learn what the distance would be if traversed in a small boat, proceeding as such a boat would be likely to proceed. In a more recent letter, April 9, 1915, the Acting Hydrographer, after confirming the statements I have just made, adds:

> A review of the distances stated in these letters does not disclose any reason for change, except that when the measurement of the length of the coast line between East Cape and Anadir Bay is not carried into a greater degree of detail than the measurement of the length of coast line from Kolima River to East Cape, it would probably not exceed 800 nautical miles, instead of reaching the amount of 1045 miles.

Very truly yours,
F. A. GOLDER.

HISTORICAL NEWS

A General Index to volumes XI.–XX. of this journal will be prepared as soon as possible after the issue of this present number, which completes vol. XX. This index, as well as that for vols. I.–X. published ten years ago, may be ordered now for $1; after the publication of the second index both will be sold by the Macmillan Company at $1.25 each. Orders should be sent to them, at 66 Fifth Avenue, New York. The price mentioned is for books in paper binding. If indexes bound in black half-morocco, uniform with the binding for the REVIEW, are desired, 50 cents should be added.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

It is now possible to add some further details to the announcement made in our April issue respecting the meeting of the American Historical Association in California this month. The Panama-Pacific Historical Congress, extending from July 19 to July 23, will be marked by meetings of the American Asiatic Association and of the Asiatic Institute, as well as of the historical society. The session of Tuesday morning, July 20, will be devoted to a joint meeting of the three, at which the Philippine Islands and their history will be considered, in their relations to the history of the Pacific Ocean area. In the afternoon there will be a reception, at the Panama-Pacific Exposition, to the three societies. In the evening, Professor H. Morse Stephens, president of the American Historical Association, will give his address, on the Conflict of European Nations in the Pacific Ocean. The morning session of Wednesday, July 21, will be devoted to the Northwestern States, British Columbia, and Alaska in their relations to the Pacific Ocean, the afternoon to Spanish-America and the Pacific Ocean, while in the evening an address on Spain and the Pacific Ocean will be given by Professor Don Rafael Altamira, of Madrid. On Thursday, July 22 (at the University of California, Berkeley), the morning session will be occupied with papers on the Exploration of the Northern Pacific Ocean and the Settlement of California; the afternoon with a meeting of the California History Teachers' Association, for the consideration of the teaching of history in schools. In the evening (at San Francisco) there will be an address on the History of California, by Hon. John F. Davis. On Friday, July 23 (at Stanford University, Palo Alto), the morning and afternoon will be occupied, as already announced, with papers on the history of Australasia and the Far East, and on the history of Japan, in their respective relations with the Pacific Ocean. In the evening (at San Francisco) Mr. Rudolph J. Taussig will give an

address on the History of the Panama Canal and its Significance in the History of the Pacific Ocean.

Volume I. of the *Annual Report* for 1913 may be expected shortly from the Government Printing Office. Volume II. of the *Annual Report* is in page-proof. The Yale University Press will soon issue Miss Griffin's annual bibliography, *Writings on American History, 1913,* invaluable to the student and deserying support from all members of the Association.

The Committee of Nine "to consider the constitution, organization, and procedure of the Association", has filled a vacancy in its membership by the choice of Professor Charles H. Hull, of Cornell University, to serve in the place of Dr. James Ford Rhodes, who declined service upon the committee.

The most important article in the April number of the *History Teacher's Magazine* is that on the Municipal System of the Roman State, by Professor W. L. Westermann of the University of Wisconsin. Professor W. T. Russell of the Peabody College, Nashville, contributes to this number a list of the historical text-books published before 1861. To the May number Professor W. J. Trimble of North Dakota Agricultural College contributes a brief paper on the Agrarian History of the United States as a Subject for Research, and Professor Edgar Dawson discusses the New York Constitutional Convention. The June number offers an excellent table of contents which contains an article by Professor C. O. Davis on Realizable Educational Values in History; one by Professor W. K. Boyd on Local History in the College Curriculum, and a third by Professor M. W. Tyler on the Last Twelve Years of British Diplomacy. The usual excellent list of recent historical publications also appears.

PERSONAL

Professor Karl Theodor von Heigel, president of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences since 1904, died at Munich on March 23, at the age of seventy-two. His connection with the university of Munich had begun in 1873, when he was made a docent. In 1885 he was appointed a professor ordinarius, as successor of Giesebrecht. Besides a multitude of writings in Bavarian history, he was the author of a notable *Deutsche Geschichte vom Tode Friedrichs des Grossen zur Auflösung des alten Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1899–1911). He was a man of markedly genial and simple character. His last publication was upon an American subject, a *Festrede* which as president of the Bavarian Academy he delivered upon Count Rumford, upon occasion of the hundredth anniversary of Rumford's death.

Professor Karl Lamprecht, the most conspicuous historical writer of Germany, died on May 11, at the age of fifty-nine. For five years

he was a professor at Bonn, since 1891 at Leipzig, where his seminary for universal history and the history of civilization has long been famous. His first important publication was his *Deutsches Wirthschaftsleben im Mittelalter* (four volumes, 1886), his most celebrated, his *Deutsche Geschichte,* which, with its continuation, *Zur Jüngsten Deutschen Vergangenheit,* fills fifteen volumes (1891–1909), some of which have had five editions. He published also many controversial writings in defense of his revolutionary views upon the philosophy of history and upon historical methods. He sought, with extraordinary energy, acuteness, and self-confidence, to give history new foundations and new tendencies, by turning wholly from the study of the individual to the psychological and sociological study of the mass. In the interest of his ideas he wrote incessantly, instigated many publications, founded a school, exerted wide influence upon younger minds. Yet neither his general views nor the execution of his histories commended themselves extensively to his contemporaries. He summed up long and complex periods in simple formulae, and filled his great work with sweeping generalizations, which often showed brilliant flashes of insight, and often had no sufficient basis in fact.[1]

In France the ranks of the historians have suffered many losses in recent months from the older as well as from the younger generation. Professor Émile Amélineau, who died on January 12, 1915, aged sixty-four years, was the editor and author of numerous works relating chiefly to the religious history of Egypt. Jean Maspero, the son of Gaston Maspero, was killed in battle on February 18, aged twenty-nine years. He had already made a reputation by his scholarly publications on the Byzantine period in Egypt. Louis Émile Campardon, who died on February 23, 1915, aged seventy-eight years, and Edme Champion, who recently passed away at the age of seventy-nine years, were editors and authors of well-known works on the eighteenth century and the Revolution. Monsignor Douais, bishop of Beauvais, who had written much on the history of the Albigenses and of the Inquisition, died in March, aged sixty-seven years.

Abbé Gisbert Brom, director of the Dutch Historical Institute at Rome, died on February 6.

Professor Richard Hudson, who for thirty-two years had taught in the University of Michigan, died on February 22, at the age of sixty-nine.

Mr. Champlin Burrage, formerly of Brown University, more recently librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, has been chosen librarian of the John Carter Brown Library, in succession to Mr. George P. Winship.

[1] The kindly Heigel said to the writer of these lines nine years ago, "Lamprecht should not be so denounced and fought against. He is the most a genius of any of us. He is like a man who can improvise beautifully upon the pianoforte, but cannot play through correctly a simple sonata of Beethoven".

Dr. Annie H. Abel of Goucher College has accepted the position of associate professor at Smith College.

Mr. F. A. Sampson, who has long been secretary and librarian of the State Historical Society of Missouri, has resigned his position and been succeeded by Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker, formerly assistant librarian of the society.

Assistant Professor Percy A. Martin of Leland Stanford University is to lecture on Latin-American history at Harvard during the first half of the coming year. Courses are also expected from Senhor Oliveira Lima of Brazil.

Professor Milledge L. Bonham, jr., of Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, is preparing to write a biography of his grandfather, Milledge L. Bonham (colonel in the United States army during the Mexican War, member of the United States Congress, brigadier-general in the Confederate army, member of the Confederate Congress, and governor of South Carolina 1862–1864), and will highly appreciate the favor if anyone having letters, documents, newspapers, magazines, personal recollections, or other data concerning his ancestor, will communicate with him.

GENERAL

To promote the study of the church history of the United States, a group of scholars connected with the Catholic University of America have begun the publication of *The Catholic Historical Review*. It will be published quarterly by the university; the price will be three dollars per annum. The secretary of the editorial board is Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday. The first number (April) gives assurance of good scholarship and of interesting contents, and thereby of a valuable contribution to the fabric of American church history. After prefatory remarks by Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Shahan, rector of the university, the following articles are printed: a brief first paper concerning the Flemish Franciscan Missionaries in North America (1674–1738), by Bishop Maes of Covington, an account of the life of the Rev. John C. Fenwick (1759–1815), our first native Dominican, by Rev. V. F. O'Daniel, O. P., an article on the First Ecclesiastical Synod of California (1852), by Rev. Zephyrin Engelhardt, O. F. M., and a discussion of Columbus and the Santa Hermandad in 1492, by Professor Charles H. McCarthy. The further contents include a summary of the *Berichte* (1831–1842) of the Leopoldine Association, founded in Vienna in 1829 for the purpose of supporting American missions; a pastoral letter (1827) of Bishop Edward Fenwick of Cincinnati; letters from and to Gardoqui in 1786 (one of them from Dr. John Carroll), relative to the Spanish king's assistance in the building of St. Peter's Church in New York City; useful remarks on Catholic archives in America; book-reviews, etc. The new journal is distinctly to be welcomed, and its editors are to be congratulated.

The Benedictine scholar, P. R. Kögel, has published a useful manual on *Die Photographie Historischer Dokumente nebst den Grundzügen der Reproduktionsverfahren, wissenschaftlich und praktisch dargestellt* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1914, pp. 119), as a supplement to the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen.*

The *Interpretation of History* by L. Cecil Jane (Dent) applies the author's theory of the age-long conflict between universalism and individualism to the history of England.

The second volume of A. Segre, *Manuale di Storia del Commercio* (Turin, Lattes, 1915, pp. 513), treats the period since 1789. The first volume was published in 1913.

A French captain of engineers, A. Genez, published, on the eve of the present war, *Historique de la Guerre Souterraine* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914).

As was to be expected, the 1914 volume of the *New International Year Book* (Dodd, Mead) devotes much space to a treatment of the war in its various aspects. This has not, however, prevented the inclusion of other noteworthy activities of the year.

Messrs. Marcus and Weber of Bonn have added to their educational series of *Kleine Texte* the Greek text of the temple-chronicle of Lindos, discovered in 1904 by the Danish Lindos-expedition, and the Latin texts of *Die Römischen Krönungseide der Deutschen Kaiser.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. De Launay, *Les Champs de Bataille prédestinés, Histoire et Géologie* (Revue des Deux Mondes, January 1); G. Sigwart, *Die Fruchtbarkeit des Bodens also Historischer Faktor* (Schmollers Jahrbuch, XXXIX. 1).

ANCIENT HISTORY

Dr. J. Dugallier's thesis deals with *Les Institutions Judiciaires de l'Égypte Ancienne* (Paris, Gamber, 1914, pp. 196). A small volume by Carl Wessely, *Aus der Welt der Papyri* (Leipzig, Haessel, 1914, pp. 106), contains a short sketch of Egyptian history and conditions to A. D. 642, as revealed by the papyri, and a bibliography. A. Heisenberg and L. Wenger have issued the first part of *Byzantinische Papyri* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. x, 203, 37 folio plates) from the royal library in Munich.

A volume by Professor Eduard Meyer on *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter* (Berlin, Curtius, 1914, pp. viii, 168) opens a new series, *Kunst und Altertum, Alte Kulturen im Lichte Neuer Forschung.* The volume is abundantly illustrated.

The most recent volume in the Columbia University *Oriental Studies* is Dr. Wallace B. Fleming's *History of the City of Tyre.*

H. R. H. Hall has furnished an admirable summary of the recent discoveries in the lands around the Aegean, which have revealed the early Aegean civilization, in *Aegean Archaeology* (New York, Putnam, 1915, pp. 269).

In the series entitled *Records of Civilization,* heretofore described as in preparation by the Columbia University Press, the first volume, *Hellenic Civilization,* by Dr. G. W. Botsford and Dr. E. G. Sihler, will before long be published.

A. Bouché-Leclercq has published the second volume of his *Histoire des Séleucides, 329–64* (Paris, Leroux, 1914).

C. Casati de Casatis has issued the second portion of *Les Étrusques: leur Langue et leur Civilisation* (Paris, Picard, 1914).

In the second volume of his *Storia Critica di Roma durante i Primi Cinque Secoli* (Rome, Loescher, 1915, pp. xv, 563), Professor Ettore Païs deals with the early republic, the decemviral legislation, and the wars against the Aequi, the Volsci, and the Etruscans.

An English translation of the *Histories* of Tacitus with introduction and notes has been published by Dr. George Gilbert Ramsay, through John Murray.

W. Klein has brought out a volume of *Studien zu Ammianus Marcellinus* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Huber, *Kultur und Wirtschaftsleben im ältesten Babylonien* (Preussische Jahrbücher, March); A. T. Olmstead, *The Earliest Book of Kings* (American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, April).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Wernle, *Jesus und Paulus, Antithesen zu Boussets Kyrios Christos* (Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XXV. 1); P. Corssen, *Das Martyrium des Bischofs Cyprian* (Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, XV. 3, 4; XVI. 1).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Volumes XI. and XII. of Mann's *Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages,* are to appear shortly.

R. Sabbadini has continued his interesting account of the Renaissance manuscript hunters in *Le Scoperte dei Codici Latini e Greci ne' Secoli XIV. e XV.* (Florence, Sansoni, 1914, pp. 274).

Messrs. Scribner will soon publish a biography of Huss by Dr. David Schaff, to be entitled *John Huss: his Life, Teachings, and Death, after Five Hundred Years.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Coulin, *Die Wüstung, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Strafrechts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Deutschen und Französischen Hochmittelalters* (Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, XXXII. 3); C. Sachsse, *Tiara und Mitra der Päpste* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXV. 4).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The period since 1650 is covered in the seventh volume of Mortier's *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (Paris, Picard, 1914, pp. x, 538). A volume on *I Domenicani in Lucca* (Lucca, Baroni, 1914) has been published by I. Taurisano.

The Oxford University Press has issued, as one of the "Oxford Pamphlets", *Select Treaties and Documents to Illustrate the Development of the Modern European States System*, by R. B. Mowat.

Karl Marx, Pangermaniste, et l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs de 1864 à 1870 (Paris, Colin, 1915) is an attempt by James Guillaume, based largely on the recently published correspondence between Marx and Engel, to prove that the activity of Marx in the International was anti-French and pro-German in character. The book has been the subject of lively controversy in the French press. F. Brupbacher has written on another phase of Marx's relations with the International in *Marx und Bakunin: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Internationalen Arbeiterassoziation* (Munich, Birk, 1914).

In Schücking and Wehberg's series of *Völkerrechtliche Monographien*, the third volume is a study of *Die Völkerrechtliche Stellung Aegyptens* (Breslau, Kern, 1914), by Freiherr von Mayer.

The British government has published *Correspondence between his Majesty's Government and the United States Government respecting the Rights of Belligerents* [Cd. 7816].

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Anonymous, *Le Deliberazioni del Congresso di Vienna, Settembre 1814–Giugno 1815* (Civiltà Cattolica, February 20); M. Schäfer, *Bremen und die Kontinentalsperre* (Hansische Geschichtsblätter, 1914, 2); F. Zweybrück, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Bündnisses zwischen dem Deutschen Reiche und Oesterreich-Ungarn* (Deutsche Rundschau, February).

THE GREAT WAR

Two parts of a bibliography of *Die Deutsche Kriegsliteratur* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914–1915, pp. 22, 24) list the German publications which appeared during the first seven months of the war, some 2900 titles. A. Maire and A. Pereire are preparing *Les Sources de l'Histoire de la Guerre Européenne, 1914–1915* (Paris, Champion, 1915), which will include all publications in French relating to the war.

The important documents of international law applicable to the war, from the Declaration of Paris to the Declaration of London, are collected in *Conventions et Déclarations entre les Puissances concernant l'Arbitrage, la Guerre, et la Neutralité* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1914, pp. 272). The German proclamations for the administration of Belgium, issued between September 5 and December 26, are collected by C. H. Huberich and A. Nicol-Speyer in *Législation Allemande en Belgique, Bulletin Officiel des Lois et Arrêtés pour le Territoire Belge Occupé, Réimpression Textuelle* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1915, pp. 120).

In *Deutsches Seekriegsrecht* (Berlin, Heymann, 1915, pp. viii, 188), H. Pohl has collected the more important documents relating to maritime law in war-time. An exhaustive treatment of the subject has been produced by Dr. H. Wehberg, in *Das Seekriegsrecht* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1915, pp. xi, 456), published in Stier-Somlo's *Handbuch des Völkerrechts.*

The American Association for International Conciliation prints, as the sixth issue in its series of "Documents regarding the European War", the *Austrian Red Book* in an official translation prepared by the Austrian government, and as the seventh, the *Serbian Blue Book.*

Additional discussions of the causes and preliminaries of the war will be found in F. Luckwaldt, *Die Vorgeschichte des Krieges* (Danzig, Kafemann, 1915, pp. 111); A. Gauvain, *Les Origines de la Guerre Européenne* (Paris, Colin, 1915, pp. 333), which includes a reprint of the author's articles in the *Journal des Débats* from the assassination of the Archduke to the outbreak of the war; P. Saintyves, *Les Responsabilités de l'Allemagne dans la Guerre de 1914* (Paris, Nourry, 1915, pp. 552), which traces Germany's foreign policy since 1870. Of special note is W. Wundt, *Die Nationen und ihre Philosophie: ein Kapitel zum Weltkrieg* (Leipzig, Kröner, 1915).

A third edition of General Maitrot's *Nos Frontières de l'Est et du Nord, l'Offensive par la Belgique, la Défense de la Lorraine* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1915, pp. ix, 135), which first appeared in 1911, reveals how many events of 1914 were anticipated by this series of articles.

The events to the middle of November are narrated in the first volume of *Chronik des Deutschen Krieges nach Amtlichen Berichten und Zeitgenössischen Kundgebungen* (Munich, Beck, 1914, pp. xii, 484); and to the battles around Lodz, in the first volume of *Der Weltkrieg, 1914–1915* (Leipzig, Reclam, 1915) by Major-General von Loebell. Five parts have appeared of the *Illustrierte Weltkriegschronik der Leipziger Illustrierten Zeitung,* for which the text is written by P. Schreckenbach. *Der Weltkrieg in Bildern und Dokumenten nebst einem Kriegstagebuch* (Leipzig, Meulenhoff, 1914, pp. 293) is a compilation by H. F. Helmolt.

Two remarkably interesting accounts of war times in Germany are E. Altiar, *Journal d'une Française en Allemagne, Juillet–Octobre, 1914: En Silesie, À Berlin, Comment j'ai quitté l'Allemagne* (Paris, Perrin, 1915); and P. Balmer, *Les Allemands chez eux pendant la Guerre, de Cologne à Vienne, Impressions d'une Neutre* (*ibid.*).

The daily commentaries on the war by Joseph Reinach in the *Figaro* from August 4 to December 31 are collected in *La Guerre de 1914, Commentaires de "Polybe"* (Paris, Charpentier, 1915, pp. x, 374). The Paris publishing house of Hachette is issuing in semi-monthly parts a *Histoire de la Guerre par "Le Bulletin des Armées"*. Franc-Nohain and P. Delay began in March the publication in parts of an *Histoire Anecdotique de la Guerre de 1914–1915* (Paris, Lethielleux). Still another such publication is *1914! Pages de Guerre écrites au Jour le Jour* (Nancy, Rigot).

Commandant de Balincourt has prepared a useful compilation relating to the navies and to naval warfare in 1914, entitled *Les Flottes de Combat en 1914* (Paris, Challamel, 1914, pp. viii, 792). Rear-Admiral Kalau vom Hofe has written a brief account of the activities of the German fleet through February, *Unsere Flotte im Weltkriege, 1914–1915* (Berlin, Mittler, 1915, pp. vi, 118).

The Department of State has printed, as a folio pamphlet of 88 pages, *Diplomatic Correspondence with Belligerent Governments relating to Neutral Rights and Commerce*. The documents relate to contraband, restraints on commerce, the *Wilhelmina*, and the *William P. Frye*, and are, with one exception, of dates previous to May 1.

P. Häberlin of Bern and G. de Reynold of Geneva have announced the founding of a *Revue des Nations*, and seek international co-operation to consider the renewal of intellectual intercourse between France and Germany. The enterprise is significant of the peculiar problem of Switzerland.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Munroe Smith, *Military Strategy versus Diplomacy in Bismarck's Time and Afterward* (Political Science Quarterly, March); F. Lenz, *Die Politischen Voraussetzungen des Modernen Krieges* (Deutsche Rundschau, January, February); Count Jules Andrássy, *Considérations sur les Origines de la Guerre* (Revue Politique Internationale, January); E. Bernstein, *Die Internationale der Arbeiter Klasse und der Europäische Krieg* (Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, XL. 2); J. de Lanessan, *Comment l'Éducation Allemande a créé la Barbarie Germanique* (Revue des Deux Mondes, April 10); C. Rist, *La Préparation Financière de l'Allemagne à la Guerre* (Revue de Paris, March 15); A. Sartorius, *Die Entwickelung der Deutschen und der Englischen Volkswirtschaft im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert und der Weltkrieg* (Zeitschrift für Politik, VIII. 1); E. Meyer, *Englands Krieg gegen Deutschland und die Probleme der Zu-*

kunft (Scientia, March); L. Latzarus, *Les Journaux pendant la Guerre, Notes d'un Journaliste* (Revue de Paris, April 15); R. Eucken, *Neutralität* (Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte, April); P. O. d'Agostino, *La Neutralità della Svizzera* (Rassegna Contemporanea, February 20); R. A. Reiss, *Les Armées Austro-Hongroises en Serbie, Notes d'un Criminaliste Practicien* (Revue de Paris, April 1); J. E. Blanche, *Lettres d'un Artiste, 1914–1915* (*ibid.*, March 15, April 1, 15); T. Rocholl, *Kriegsbriefe eines Malers, mit sechszehn Bildern aus der Studienmappe des Schlachtenmalers* (Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte, April); O. Vaschin, *Der Krieg und das Wetter*, I. (Deutsche Rundschau, April); C. Le Goffic, *Dixmude, un Chapitre de l'Histoire des Fusiliers Marins* (Revue des Deux Mondes, March 1, 15).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

English History relative to European Movements by G. H. Reed (London, Harrap) aims to show the effect of Continental history on that of English.

Much interesting material has been brought together in Rev. James B. Johnston's *The Place-Names of England and Wales* published by John Murray.

The *Social Works* series, published by Messrs. Adam and Charles Black, contains among its recent additions volume I. of *An Introduction to the Economic History of England*, by Mr. E. Lipson.

A careful study of the early Irish culture is found in Professor R. A. S. Macalister's *Muiredach, Abbot of Monasterboice, 890–923 A. D.: his Life and Surroundings.*

The Selden Society has in preparation *Year Books of 5 Edward II.*; *Select Cases before the King's Council*, ed. James F. Baldwin; *Select Ecclesiastical Pleas*, ed. Harold D. Hazeltine; Vacarius's *Liber Pauperum*, ed. F. de Zulueta; *Public Works in Mediaeval Law*, ed. Cyril Flower; *Select Entries from the Court Books of Chartered Companies*, ed. Cecil T. Carr; and *Select Cases from the Exchequer of Pleas*, ed. Hilary Jenkinson.

A valuable work for those interested in the history of education is Mr. A. F. Leach's *The Schools of Medieval England*, published by the Macmillan Company.

A *Life of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury*, by Algernon Cecil, is based on a thorough study of state papers.

The History of the Evelyn Family by Helen Evelyn (London, Eveleigh Nash) is an excellent specimen of family biography, dealing with a family whose history covers many years and includes numerous interesting figures.

In *Anne Hyde, Duchess of York,* by J. R. Henslowe (London, Laurie), the life of the first wife of James II. is illustrated by contemporary letters.

Bulletin No. 15 of the Department of History and Political and Economic Science in Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, is *Modern British Foreign Policy* by J. L. Morison.

The *Home University Library* has added to the series an excellent volume entitled *Political Thought in England from Herbert Spencer to the Present Day,* by Mr. E. Barker.

F. A. M. Webster's *Britain's Territorials in Peace and War* (Sidgwick and Jackson) is an account of the origin and organization of the Territorial Force.

Arthur E. P. Browne Weigall, for many years inspector-general of antiquities in Egypt, has written *A History of Events in Egypt from 1798 to 1914,* giving a series of sketches of the men prominent in Egyptian history in the last century.

An interesting chapter in modern history is told by the Earl of Cromer in *Abbas II.* (Macmillan).

The second volume of *Historical Records of Australia* contains governors' despatches to and from England between 1797 and 1800.

British government publications: *Statute Rolls of the Parliament of Ireland,* 1–12 Edward IV., ed. Henry F. Berry (Dublin, 1914).

Other documentary publications: *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters,* vol. II., *Wardens' Account Book,* 1438–1516 (London, the Company).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: The Dean of Durham [H. H. Henson], *Magna Charta* (Edinburgh Review, April); R. Munro, *The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Scotland* (Scottish Historical Review, April); Gaillard Lapsley, *Archbishop Stratford and the Parliamentary Crisis of 1341,* II. (English Historical Review, April); R. Häpke, *Die Handelspolitik der Tudors* (Hansische Geschichtsblätter, 1914, 2); S. A. Peyton, *The Village Population in the Tudor Lay Subsidy Rolls* (English Historical Review, April); E. R. Turner, *The Privy Council of 1679* (*ibid.*); R. S. Rait, *Parliamentary Representation in Scotland: Councils and Conventions* (Scottish Historical Review, April).

FRANCE

General reviews: H. Hauser, *Histoire de France, XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ Siècles* (Revue Historique, March); R. Lévy, *Histoire Intérieure du Second Empire* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, January).

The Gallic, Roman, Merovingian, and Carolingian periods are treated

in the first volume of the *Manuel de Numismatique Française* (Paris, Picard, 1915, pp. vii, 431), by A. Blanchte and A. Dieudonné.

The numerous recent biographies of women are added to by H. Noel Williams's *Life of Margaret d'Angoulême* published in London by Nash.

H. Gillot has made a study of the German pamphlet literature against Louis XIV. in *Le Règne de Louis XIV. et l'Opinion Publique en Allemagne* (Nancy, Crépin-Leblond, 1914, pp. xvii, 375, review by C. Pfister, *Revue Historique,* January). The volume contains a list of the pamphlets used. A recent volume by M. D'Angelo is on *Luigi XIV. e la Santa Sede* (Rome, 1914).

The twenty-third volume of Professor Aulard's *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public avec la Correspondance Officielle des Représentants en Mission* (Paris, Leroux, 1913, pp. 877) includes the period from May 10 to June 2, 1795. There are some interesting letters with regard to the peace negotiations then in progress, such as the letter of Merlin of Thionville of May 20, with regard to German affairs and the letter of the same date with regard to Spain from Pelet de la Lozère. The various letters from the representatives in the newly conquered Holland also offer much of interest. The numerous letters from Blaux at Amiens are illustrative of internal affairs.

The Life of Barnave, by E. D. Bradley (Clarendon Press), is a two-volume work based on contemporary documents.

A new volume on *La Jeunesse de Bonaparte* (Tours, Mame, 1915, pp. 292) is by Jules Mazé. B. L. Smith, *Napoleon's Elba* (Florence, Seeber, 1914, pp. 99), and V. Mellini, *L'Isola d'Elba durante il Governo di Napoleone I.* (Florence, 1914, pp. xvi, 376) are new accounts of the first exile of the Emperor. A Danish work on the return from Elba is *Napoleons Hjemkomst fra Elba, 1ste–2ode Marts, 1815* (Odense, Hempel, 1914, pp. 240), by K. Schmidt. R. Rönsch, *Belle Alliance* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1914, pp. vii, 104) is a popular account of the Waterloo campaign.

The John C. Winston Company has issued a two-volume study on *Napoleon in Exile at St. Helena (1815–1821),* by Mr. Norwood Young.

Dr. H. Louvancour has published his thesis, *De Henri de Saint-Simon à Charles Fourier, Étude sur le Socialisme Romantique Français de 1830* (Chartres, Durand, 1914, pp. 452).

Comte de Maugny's *Cinquante Ans de Souvenirs* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. viii, 318) contains many interesting items relating to various prominent personages of the latter half of the nineteenth century. Special mention may be made of the portion relating to Boulanger.

John N. Raphael has written a breezy account of *The Caillaux Drama* (London, Goschen, 1914, pp. 322).

A. Ambrosi, of the lycée at Bastia, has accumulated a mass of information in *Histoire des Corses et de leur Civilisation* (Bastia, 1914, pp. vii, 607).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. André-Michel, *Le Développement des Villes dans le Comtat-Venaissin, Avignon au Temps des Premiers Papes* (Revue Historique, March); L. Mirot, *Autour de la Paix d'Arras, 1414–1415* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, May, 1914); L. Mouton, *Le Duc d'Épernon et l'Archevêque de Bordeaux* (Revue des Études Historiques, July, January); A. Degert, *Le Chapeau du Cardinal de Richelieu* (Revue Historique, March); P. Bonnefon, *Retz et ses Mémoires* (Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France, July, 1914); A. Mathiez, *Les Divisions dans les Comités de Gouvernement à la Veille de Thermidor, d'après quelques Documents inédits* (Revue Historique, January); E. Driault, *Une Conception Nouvelle de la Politique Extérieure de Napoléon* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, January); G. Rudler, *Le Vrai "Journal Intime" de Benjamin Constant, 1814–1815* (*ibid.*); E. Mayer, *La Responsabilité de Napoléon III. dans la Faillite de l'Artillerie Française en 1870* (*ibid.*); E. Daudet, *Autour de la Crise de 1875, Notes et Souvenirs* (Revue des Deux Mondes, April 15).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: C. Rinaudo, *Pubblicazioni sulla Guerra Libica* (Rivista Storica Italiana, April).

The following publications useful for the bibliography of Italian history have recently appeared: C. Cipolla, *Pubblicazioni sulla Storia Medioevale Italiana* (Venice, Istituto Veneto di Arti Grafiche, 1914, pp. 379); E. Casanova, *Gli Archivi Provinciali del Mezzogiorno d'Italia e della Sicilia* (Siena, Lazzeri, 1914, pp. 119); and S. de Pilato, *Saggio Bibliografico sulla Basilicata* (Potenza, Garramone, 1914, pp. xix, 196).

Recent publications of the Istituto Storico Italiano include P. Egidi, *Necrologi e Libri affini della Provincia Romana* (vol. II., *Necrologi della Città di Roma*, Rome, tip. Senato, 1914, pp. ix, 548); A. Crivellucci, *Pauli Diaconi Historia Romana* (*ibid.*, pp. lxi, 305); C. Cipolla, *Le Opere di Ferreto de' Ferreti Vicentino* (vol. II., *ibid.*, pp. 298); G. Monticolo and E. Besta, *I Capitolari delle Arti Veneziane dalle Origini al 1330* (vol. III., *ibid.*, pp. xlii, 416). L. Simeoni has edited *Gli Antichi Statuti delle Arti Veronesi secondo la Revisione Scaligera del 1319* (Venice, tip. Emiliana, 1914, pp. lxxiii, 495); and A. Fierens, *Suppliques d'Urbain V., 1362–1370* (Rome, Bretschneider, 1914, pp. xxiii, 986).

A discussion *Sulla Questione dell' Unità o Dualità del Diritto in Italia sotto la Dominazione Ostrogota* (Milan, Hoepli, 1913) is by P. del Giudice. The second volume of Besta, *Storia del Diritto Italiano* (Pisa, Galleri, 1914) relates to the Lombard period, as does G. Ferrari, *Ricerche sul Diritto Ereditario in Occidente nell' Alto Medioevo, sopratutto nel*

Regno Longobardico (Venice, Ferrari, 1914, pp. viii, 211). In the realm of private law, F. Schupfer has published *Il Diritto Privato dei Popoli Germanici, con speciale Riguardo all' Italia, II. La Famiglia* (Rome, Loescher, 1914, pp. vi, 307); and P. S. Leicht, *Ricerche sul Diritto Privato nei Documenti Preirneriani* (Rome, Athenaeum, 1914, pp. 211). B. Brugi has written an essay *Per la Storia della Giurisprudenza e delle Università Italiane* (Turin, Utet, 1914, pp. ix, 250); and A. Prologo has recounted the work of *Due Grandi Giureconsulti del Secolo XIII., Andrea de Barulo e Andrea d'Isernia* (Trani, Vecchi, 1914, pp. 45).

Studien zur Individualität des Franziskus von Assisi (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914) is a notable volume by Tilemann. R. Morcay, *Saint Antonin, Fondateur du Couvent de Saint-Marc, Archevêque de Florence, 1389–1459* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914, pp. xxvi, 500), is an elaborate and pious biography of a somewhat unimportant personage. A much more scholarly effort is the life of Poggio Bracciolini by Professor Ernst Walser of Zurich, *Poggius Florentinus, Leben und Werke* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. viii, 567).

Two volumes of *Lettere* (Bari, Laterza, 1914, pp. xviii, 241, 357) from Bernardo Tanucci to Ferdinando Galiani have been published.

It is announced that King Victor Emmanuel III. is preparing a collection of some 800 letters of his grandfather, Victor Emmanuel II. V. Boragine is the author of an account of *Lo Storico Incontro di Vittorio Emanuele II. e Garibaldi, 26 Ottobre 1860* (S. Maria C. V., Cavotta, 1914, pp. 199).

From the many contributions to the local history of modern Italy, the following may be selected as among the more important: F. Cognasso, *Documenti Inediti e Sparsi sulla Storia di Torino* (Turin, Baravalle, 1914, pp. viii, 405); G. Jalla, *Storia della Riforma in Piemonte fino alla Morte di Emanuele Filiberto, 1517–1580* (Florence, Claudiana, 1914, pp. iv, 411); V. Mauro, *Il Vicereame di Napoli al Tempo del Duca d'Alcalá, 1559–1571* (Pesaro, Federici, 1914, pp. 81); P. L. Levati, *I Dogi di Genova e Vita Genovese, 1746–1771* (Genoa, Gioventù, 1915, pp. 424); G. Signorelli, *Viterbo dal 1789 al 1870* (vol. I., Viterbo, Minissi, 1914, pp. 713); G. Paladino, *La Rivoluzione Napoletana nel 1848* (Milan, Vallardi, 1914, pp. viii, 203); and C. Cesari, *La Difesa di Roma nel 1849* (*ibid.*, 1913, pp. 140).

The judicial archives stored in the Palace of Justice of Madrid are reported to have been destroyed by fire on May 4–5.

The Junta para Ampliación de Estudios é Investigaciones Científicos has recently published the following volumes of historical documents: *Capitulaciones con Francia y Negociaciones Diplomáticas de los Embajadores de España, 1265–1714* (Madrid, 1914, pp. xii, 902), edited by Don Julián Paz, from the Archives of Simancas; *El Consejo Supremo*

de Aragón en el Reinado de Felipe II., Estudio y Transcripción de los Documentos Originales y Inéditos de este Consejo, existentes en el Museo Británico (Madrid, 1915, pp. xcix, 386), edited by Professor C. Riba y García; and *Correspondencia Diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el Pontificado de S. Pio V.* (3 vols., Madrid, 1914), edited by L. Serrano.

The principal contents of the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla* for April, 1915 (año III., núm. 7), are two articles by Professor Vicente Lloréns Asensio. One treats of the bulls of Alexander VI. concerning the possession of the Indies and the division of the earth, and includes Spanish translations of the bulls *Inter Caetera* of May 3 and 4, 1493, and *Romanus Pontifex,* issued by Nicholas V. on January 8, 1454/5. The second article gives the evidence for the conclusion that Martin Alonso Pinzon was not only no enemy of Columbus but afforded him the most valuable aid. While neither paper contains newly-discovered facts, both are notably clear, well-reasoned, and well-informed.

The third volume of *Relaciones entre España e Inglaterra durante la Guerra de la Independencia* (Madrid, Beltrán, 1914, pp. 532), by the Marqués de Villa-Urrutia, relates to the years 1812–1814 and includes the Congress of Vienna. F. Anton del Olmet has issued the fifth volume of *El Cuerpo Diplomático Español en la Guerra de la Independencia* (Madrid, Pueyo, 1914, pp. 219).

A. Flores Caamaño has published an account of *Don José Mejía Lequerica en las Cortes de Cádiz de 1810 à 1813, o sea el Principal Defensor de los Intereses de la América Española en la más Grande Asamblea de la Península* (Barcelona, Maucci, 1914, pp. 576).

J. del Nido y Segalerva is the author of *Historia Política y Parlamentaria del Excelentísimo Sr. D. Antonio Cánovas del Castillo* (Madrid, Velasco, 1914, pp. 1081).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: V. Cian, *La Candidatura di Ferdinando di Savoia al Trono di Sicilia, 1848* (Nuova Antologia, April 1); J. Pozzi, *L'Italia Irredenta* (Revue des Deux Mondes, February 1); J. Alazard, *La Neutralité Italienne* (Revue Politique Internationale, January); "Victor", *L'Italia nella Conflagrazione Internazionale, l'Italia non è la Turchia* (Nuova Antologia, March 16); R. Michels, *I Problemi Attuali della Politica Italiana* (*ibid.*, April 1); "Victor", *Problemi Interni e Problemi Internazionali* (*ibid.*, April 1); A. Eitel, *Rota und Rueda* (Archiv für Urkundenforschung, V. 3); R. Costes, *Le Mariage de Philippe II. et de l'Infante Marie de Portugal, Relation d'Alonso de Sanabria, Évêque de Drivasto* (Bulletin Hispanique, January).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Walther Vogel has issued the first volume of a *Geschichte der Deutschen Seeschiffahrt* (1915). A small volume on *La Marine de Guerre Allemande avant Guillaume II.* (Paris, Challamel, 1914) was published by R. Cayrol before the outbreak of war.

Pre-reformation and general materials are included in the first volume of *Quellenkunde der Deutschen Reformationsgeschichte* (Gotha, Perthes, 1915) edited by G. Wolf.

The A. J. Holman Company of Philadelphia announce a ten-volume translation of the most important works of Luther, with introduction and notes.

The fourth volume of Dr. Hartmann Grisar's *Luther,* translated by E. M. Lamond and edited by Luigi Cappadelta, has come from the press of Messrs. Kegan Paul.

In a little volume on *Staat und Kirche* (*Aus Natur und Geisteswelt,* no. 485, Leipzig, Teubner, 1915, pp. 118), Dr. A. Pfannkuche has furnished a good succinct statement of the changing relations of Church and State in Germany from the Reformation to the present day and given a statement of the present situation in the several German states. There are two or three pages on the relations of Church and State in the United States and a paragraph or two on the conditions in other countries.

R. Wolff has edited an interesting volume, *Vom Berliner Hofe zur Zeit Friedrich Wilhelms I., Berichte des Braunschweiger Gesandten in Berlin, 1728–1733* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914).

The centenary of Bismarck's birth has given occasion for the appearance of a considerable group of publications, mostly trivial or occasional in nature. Among the best are Erich Marcks, *Otto von Bismarck, ein Lebensbild* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1915, pp. xi, 256), and Otto Baumgarten, *Bismarcks Glaube* (Tübingen, 1915, pp. 324). A. von Brauer, E. Marcks, and K. A. von Müller have compiled *Erinnerungen an Bismarck, Aufzeichnungen von Mitarbeitern und Freunden des Fürsten, mit einem Anhange von Dokumenten und Briefen* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1915, pp. xii, 421). P. Liman has prepared a popular illustrated volume, *Bismarck in Geschichte, Karikatur, und Anekdote* (Stuttgart, Strecker and Schröder, 1915, pp. xi, 300). More Bismarck family correspondence appears in E. Heyck, *Johanna von Bismarck: ein Lebensbild in Briefen, 1844–1894* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1915, pp. 369). Two Bismarck episodes are the subjects of F. Lowenthal, *Der Preussische Verfassungsstreit, 1862–1866* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914, pp. xii, 342), and R. Fester, *Die Genesis der Emser Depesche* (Berlin, Paetel, 1915, p. 240).

Arthur Dix has published a second edition of his *Deutscher Imperialismus* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914, pp. iv, 110) which first appeared in 1912. Two French views are presented in H. Andrillon, *L'Expansion de l'Allemagne, ses Causes, ses Formes, ses Conséquences* (Paris, Rivière, 1914), and in J. Flach, *Essai sur la Formation de l'Esprit Public Allemand* (Paris, 1914).

The special legislation for the period of war in Germany is contained in L. Hess, *Die Kriegsgesetze zur Abhilfe Wirtschaftlicher Schädigungen, mit ausführlicher Inhaltsübersicht und kurzen Erläuterungen* (Stuttgart, Hess, 1914, pp. 78); and in *Kriegs-, Zivil-, und Finanzgesetze vom 4. August 1914* (Berlin, Gutentag, 1914, pp. 121).

The first volume of a *Geschichte der Stadt Essen* (Essen, Baedeker, 1914) has been published by K. Ribbeck. W. Berdrow has compiled a volume on *Friedrich Krupp, der Gründer der Gussstahlfabrik, in Briefen und Urkunden* (*ibid.*, 1915).

Count Khevenhüller-Metsch and Dr. Hanns Schlitter have published the part for 1756–1757 of *Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias, Tagebuch des Fürsten Johann Josef Khevenhüller-Metsch, Kaiserlichen Oberhofmeisters, 1742–1776* (Vienna, Holzhausen, 1914). The missing volumes of the diary for these two eventful years were found in the possession of Countess Aglae Kinsky. So far as published the diary now covers the years 1742–1749, and 1752–1759. G. Holzknecht has made a notable contribution to the history of the reforms of Joseph II. in *Ursprung und Herkunft der Reformideen Kaiser Josefs II. auf Kirchlichem Gebiete* (Innsbruck, Wagner, 1914). K. Hugelmann's collection of *Historisch-Politische Studien* (Vienna, Roller, 1915) contains essays on Austrian history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The Middle Ages are covered in the second volume of P. H. Scheffel, *Verkehrsgeschichte der Alpen* (Berlin, Reimer, 1914). *Die Schweiz und die Europäische Handelspolitik* (Zürich, Füssli, 1914) is by P. H. Schmidt. O. Weiss, *Die Tessinischen Landvogteien der XII Orte im 18. Jahrhundert* (Zürich, Leemann, 1915) is an important contribution to Swiss local history published in *Schweizer Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Kühn, *Zur Entstehung des Wormser Edikts* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXV. 3, 4); L. Bertrand, *Goethe et le Germanisme* (Revue des Deux Mondes, April 15); A. Leitzmann, *Wilhelm von Humboldt, Reisetagebücher, 1788–1789* (Die Neue Rundschau, January–April); F. Meusel, *Aus Marwitz' Memoiren: der Zusammenbruch des Preussischen Staates, 1806*, I., II. (Deutsche Rundschau, March, April); F. Meusel, *Bismarck, Arnstedt, und der Patriotische Verein der Zauche, 1848–1852* (*ibid.*, April); O. Baumgarten, *Bismarck als Religiöser Charakter* (Preussische Jahrbücher, April); H. Oncken, *Bismarck, zur Feier seines Hundertjährigen*

Geburtstags (Die Neue Rundschau, April); H. Welschinger, *L'Oeuvre de Bismarck à propos d'un Anniversaire* (Revue des Deux Mondes, April 1); F. Rachfahl, *Die Innere Politik Bismarcks und die Gegenwart* (Deutsche Rundschau, April); A. Dix, *Die Wirtschaftliche Mobilmachung Deutschlands, 1914* (Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik, CIV. 1); V. Porri, *L'Organizzazione dell' Economia Germanica e la Crisi della Guerra* (La Riforma Sociale, February); Tschierschky, *Die Kriegs-Getreidepolitik Deutschlands, 1914* (Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft, VI. 3, 4); G. Fagniez, *La Transylvanie Indépendante et Sujette* (Revue des Deux Mondes, April 1).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The German-Belgian question of an earlier generation is fully discussed in Schwahn's *Die Beziehungen der Katholischen Rheinlande und Belgiens in den Jahren 1830–1840* (Strassburg, Herder, 1914).

The Belgian government has published *La Neutralité de la Belgique* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1915, pp 165) which contains the Gray Book and other documents down to October 14, with a preface by Paul Hymans of the Belgian ministry; and *La Violation du Droit des Gens en Belgique* (*ibid.*, 1915, pp. 167) which contains the official reports of the commission of investigation with a preface by the cabinet minister J. van den Heuvel. Differing views of the Belgian question are set forth in E. Waxweiller, *La Belgique Neutre et Loyale* (Lausanne, Payot, 1915) and *Hat Belgien sein Schicksal verschuldet?* (Zürich, Füssli, 1915); O. Boulanger, *France et Belgique, 1914–1915, Ce que la France a Dit, Ce qu'elle a Fait pour la Belgique* (Paris, Hachette, 1915); A. Schulte, *Von der Neutralität Belgiens* (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1915); P. Nothomb, *Les Barbares en Belgique* (Paris, Perrin, 1915); and C. Sarolea, *L'Héroique Belgique* (Paris, Crès, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Fromme, *Der Nationalitätenkampf in und um Belgien* (Deutsche Rundschau, January); H. Gmelin, *Die Gesetzgebung zum Schutze der Vlämischen Sprache in Belgien* (Zeitschrift für Politik, VIII. 1); A. Fontainas, *Villes Flamandes Dévastées, Louvain, Malines, Ypres* (Mercure de France, April 1); E. R. Turner, *The Permanent Neutrality of Belgium* (Nation, April 15).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: G. Gautier, *Histoire de Russie, Publications de l'Année 1913* (Revue Historique, March).

The Swedish Historical Academy's annual, *Fornvännen,* for 1914 (pp. 298), contains an instructive address by Dr. Oscar Almgren of Upsala on the present state of researches respecting the earliest population of Sweden; a survey, by Dr. Eskil Olsson, of the prehistoric structures in Ångermanland; and a very interesting illustrated paper by

Professor O. Montelius on the runic inscriptions relating to warriors who took part in expeditions to the eastward—to Russia, the Greek Empire, and the Orient.

The first volume of *La Suède et l'Orient, Études Archéologiques sur les Relations de la Suède et de l'Orient pendant l'Age des Vikings* (Upsala, Appelberg, 1914, pp. 242), by T. J. Arne, has appeared in Lundell's *Archives d'Études Orientales.*

H. K. Steffens has published a volume on *Den Norske Central-administrations Historie, 1814–1914* (Christiania, Stenersen, 1914, pp. 397).

Dr. Robert H. Lord of Harvard University has published through the Harvard University Press *A History of Poland.*

In Περὶ τῆς οἰκονομικῆς διοικήσεως τῆς Ἑπτανήσου ἐπὶ Βενετοκρατίας (2 vols., Athens, *Hestia,* 1914), Professor A. M. Andreádes has given an excellent account of the economic administration of the Ionian islands under Venetian rule. The text is in Greek, but with an analysis in French. The author has used the Venetian archives, and gives a good bibliography. A volume on the period from 1797 to 1863 is promised.

A series of ten lectures on *Die Balkanfrage* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914, pp. 233) forms the third issue of the *Veröffentlichungen der Handelshochschule München,* edited by M. J. Bonn.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Bruno, *Oefversikt öfver Litteraturen rörande Källorna till 1809 års Regeringsform* (Statsvetenskaplig Tidskript för Politik, Statistik, Ekonomi, September); F. Bajer, *La Neutralité Scandinave* (Revue Politique Internationale, January); P. G. La Chesnais, *Le Neutralisme en Norvège* (Mercure de France, April 1); L. V. Birck, *Le Danemarck et la Guerre* (Revue Politique Internationale, January); N. D. Harris, *The Southern Slav Question* (American Political Science Review, May).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

The *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan,* vol. XLIII., part I. (Tokyo, 1915, pp. 170) is an elaborate and extensive Bibliography of Early Spanish-Japanese Relations, by Dr. James A. Robertson, librarian of the Philippine Library of Manila. The book notes material found in that library. It begins with a list of 157 manuscripts, copied from the Archives of the Indies at Seville, or brought from Barcelona as a part of the collection acquired from the Compañía General de Tabacos de Filipinas in 1913. The books, some seventy in number, were mostly printed between 1570 and 1700, and embrace many rarities. They consist largely of Jesuit relations and other records of missionary activity and martyrdom in Japan. All are fully described in this useful manual; facsimiles are given in some cases.

China, die Republik der Mitte: ihre Probleme und Aussichten (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1914, pp. viii, 264) is the work of Freiherr von Mackay.

H. G. C. Perry-Ayscough and R. B. Otter-Barry are the authors of *With the Russians in Mongolia* (New York, Lane, 1914, pp. xxii, 344).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

At the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington Professor Faust's *Guide to the Materials for American History in Swiss and Austrian Archives* has gone to the printer. The manuscripts of Mr. R. R. Hill's descriptive list of United States materials in the Cuban section of the Archives of the Indies at Seville, of Professor Golder's guide to those in Russian archives, and of the first volume (to 1648) of Miss Davenport's *Treaties between European Powers bearing on American History,* have been received.

The Library of Congress, Division of Manuscripts, has lately acquired the diary of Edmund Ruffin, 1856–1865, in 25 volumes; some 44 miscellaneous manuscripts of William Wirt, relating to his *Life of Patrick Henry*; General Philip Schuyler's memorandum-book, 1783–1787; Alexander Hamilton's outlines of argument in the case of Rutgers *v.* Waddington, 1783; the collected papers of General Samuel Smith of Maryland, of John Spear Smith, and of George Nicholas and Wilson Cary Nicholas of Virginia; and (on deposit) the committee reports of Edmund Randolph and the speeches of George Mason in the convention of 1787.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society for October, 1914, contains an account of early Harvard broadsides by Mr. William C. Lane, with several facsimiles, a paper by Mr. Thomas W. Balch on the Swedish Beginning of Pennsylvania and other events in Pennsylvania history, and an important article on the Royal Disallowance by Professor Charles M. Andrews. The bibliography of American newspapers, 1690–1820, is continued from Kentucky to Maine, inclusive, in the same thoroughgoing manner which has prevailed in the preceding installments.

In the December number of the *Magazine of History* appear George R. Prowell's third paper on Pennsylvania County Names, a continuation of Col. LeGrand B. Cannon's Personal Reminiscences of the Rebellion, and a paper of Lieutenant-Colonel S. A. Drake on the Old Army in Kansas.

The February and March numbers of *Americana* continue the papers of Rev. A. W. H. Eaton, concerning the Rhode Island Settlers on the French Lands in Nova Scotia in 1760 and 1761.

It is announced that Mr. William Abbatt plans to prepare and publish an index to the seven volumes thus far published of Avery's *History of the United States.*

Recent issues of *Magazine of History, Extra Numbers* are: *J. Wilkes Booth: or the National Tragedy* (No. 29), by W. A. Luby; *Army Life on the Pacific* (No. 30), by Lawrence Kip; Elias Darnell's *Journal* (1812–1813), etc. (No. 31); *Rare Lincolniana* (Nos. 32, 34); Evans's *Memoir* of Kosciusko, etc. (No. 36); Leslie Stephen's *The Times on the American War* (No. 37).

Messrs. Appleton have published *Readings in the History of the American Nation,* by Professor A. C. McLaughlin.

Professor Clarence W. Alvord's excellent paper on *The Relation of the State to Historical Work,* read at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Historical Society in January, 1915, has been published as the first number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin.*

Messrs. Lippincott are soon to publish *English Ancestral Homes of Noted Americans* by Mrs. Anne Hollingsworth Wharton.

Mr. John O. Austin of Providence has prepared and published a volume of *American Authors' Ancestry* in which he sets forth genealogies of 103 noted Americans, mostly authors, and mostly of Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

Under the title *The North Pole Aftermath* has been printed a speech of Honorable S. D. Fess in the House of Representatives, March 4, 1915, relating to the history of the Arctic expeditions of Admiral Peary and Doctor Cook, with reference to *House Report No. 1961,* 61 Cong., third session.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The valuable work which the War and Navy Departments have been doing, in the collecting and photographing of documents relating to the Revolutionary War, under the direction of Capt. H. C. Clark, came to a stop at the end of May, the special appropriation having been exhausted, and no new appropriation made by Congress. Photographs to the number of 30,000 have been accumulated, making a large addition to the Department's material, and completing the work for North Carolina, while that for Massachusetts and Virginia has been carried a long way toward completion. It must be regarded as unfortunate that the work cannot be continued.

The Newberry Library, Chicago, has issued as *Bulletin No. 4,* a *List of Documentary Material relating to State Constitutional Conventions, 1776–1912,* compiled by Dr. Augustus H. Shearer, of the library staff. The items number altogether 615. A limited number of copies for the use of scholars interested is available upon request.

C. F. Heartman and Company of New York have brought out three documentary volumes pertaining to the Revolution, designated as *Heartman's Historical Series,* nos. 1, 2, and 3. No. 1 is a translation from the German of *The Narrative of Johann Carl Buettner in the American Revolution*; no. 2 is *Letters Written by Ebenezer Huntington during the American Revolution,* ed. G. W. F. Blanchfield; and no. 3 is a translation from the German of A. Pfister's *The Voyage of the First Hessian Army from Portsmouth to New York, 1776.* Included in the latter volume is an extract from the diary of the German poet, J. G. Seume, one of the Hessian soldiers.

Mr. Oscar E. Rising of Rochester, New York, is the author and publisher of a biographical sketch of Gen. John Sullivan, to which is given the title *A New Hampshire Lawyer in General Washington's Army* (pp. 128). The book includes an account of Sullivan's expedition against the Six Nations in 1779.

The Revolutionary War and the Military Policy of the United States, by Gen. Francis V. Greene, which traces the gradual growth of the regular army and discusses the popular faith in untrained militia, is particularly timely in its appearance (Scribner).

The Naval History Society has just issued to members, as its sixth volume, *Letters and Papers relating to the Cruises of Gustavus Conyngham, a Captain of the Continental Navy, 1777–1779* (New York, 1915, pp. liii, 241), drawn from the manuscript collections of Mr. James Barnes and many other sources, and edited by Robert W. Neeser.

The Political and Economic Doctrines of John Marshall, and also his Letters, Speeches, and hitherto Unpublished and Uncollected Writings, edited by John E. Oster (New York, Neale, 1915) contains, along with the speeches and decisions, 140 letters, of which about a fifth are new.

The Johns Hopkins Press has lately published *The Diplomacy of the War of 1812* (pp. 504) by Professor Frank A. Updyke of Dartmouth, being the lectures delivered in 1914 on the Albert Shaw Foundation.

Messrs. Putnam have published *The Education of the Negro prior to 1861,* by C. G. Woodson.

The Bell Book and Stationery Company of Richmond have issued *A Brief Sketch of the Work of Matthew Fontaine Maury, 1861–1865,* by his son.

A Civil War volume and one on Reconstruction have recently been issued by Neale: *The Battle of Gettysburg,* by Francis Marshall, and *The Aftermath of the Civil War in Arkansas,* by P. Clayton.

Major-General Grenville M. Dodge has published *Personal Recollections of President Abraham Lincoln, General Ulysses S. Grant, and General William T. Sherman* (Council Bluffs, Monarch Press).

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

Dr. Henry S. Burrage, reappointed as state historian of Maine, has in preparation an elaborate work on *Maine in the Northeastern Boundary Controversy.*

The December–January serial of the Massachusetts Historical Society has for its chief contents a body of unpublished instructions and despatches of the British commissioners at Ghent in 1814, and a paper by the late Mr. Charles Francis Adams on the British Proclamation of May 1861. The February serial has a paper by Professor John S. Bassett on the Development of the Popular Churches after the Revolution, and one by Professor T. C. Smith on General Garfield at Chickamauga. In the March serial Mr. Samuel E. Morison prints some significant documents respecting the Massachusetts "embassy" to Washington in 1815, namely, a personal letter of Governor Strong to the three commissioners, January 31, 1815, and their secret instructions from the governor's council. Their commission and report are for convenience reprinted. The April serial is almost entirely occupied with tributes to the late Charles Francis Adams. At the annual meeting Senator Henry Cabot Lodge was made president of the society in succession to Mr. Adams.

Mr. Albert Matthews prints in advance, from volume XVII. of the *Publications* of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, pp. 293–391, an elaborate paper on the term Pilgrim Fathers, and on the early celebrations of Forefathers' Day.

The *Essex Institute Historical Collections* continues in the April number the papers of G. A. Moriarty, jr., concerning Elias Hasket, governor of New Providence, Bahamas, in 1702.

A committee of the towns of Brookfield, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, and New Braintree has just published *Quabaug, 1660–1910; an Account of the Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration held at West Brookfield, Mass., September 21, 1910* (Worcester, Davis Press, 1915, pp. 127). This contains an address by Mr. Roger Foster on the history of Brookfield, including a discussion of the Brookfield tradition that the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 was drafted by Jedediah Foster instead of by John Adams.

The *Report of the Committee on Marking Historical Sites in Rhode Island*, made to the General Assembly at its January session, 1913 (Providence, E. L. Freeman Company, 1914, pp. 183), includes a number of historical addresses, delivered on the occasions of placing the tablets: Gilbert Stuart, and Drum Rock, by William B. Weeden, the House and Home-lot of Roger Williams, and the Swamp Fight (1675), by N. M. Isham, Fort Independence, by C. S. Brigham, Lafayette (embodying several errors, typographical and other), by O. L. Bosworth, the Michael Pierce Fight (1676), by Edwin C. Pierce, Massasoit, by

Colonel T. W. Higginson, Prescott's Headquarters, by W. P. Sheffield, Stephen Hopkins, by W. E. Foster, and Esek Hopkins, by N. W. Littlefield.

The University of the State of New York, Division of History, has completed its issue of the *Public Papers of George Clinton* by the publication of volume X., being that portion of the analytical index to the series which runs from G to Z. To this has been added a list of papers of Governor Clinton in collections other than the New York State Library, and a rough bibliography of printed material relating to him.

The United Historical and Patriotic Societies and Associations of New York have offered a series of prizes for a history about one hundred thousand words in length, "that will truthfully show New York's participation in the events that led to the establishment of the United States as an independent nation, to be written in an interesting form". There is a first prize of one thousand dollars, a second of five hundred, and a third of two hundred and fifty dollars. There is a further prize of one hundred dollars offered for the best essay, containing about ten thousand words, on one of twenty-four selected subjects. The manuscripts of the history must be delivered to the secretary, Abram Wakeman, 96 Water street, New York City, by October 1, 1916. In the case of the essay no time limit seems to be set.

Under the title *The Bombardment of New York and the Fight for Independence on the Waters of New York City against the Sea Power of Great Britain in the Year 1776* Mr. Reginald P. Bolton has given more or less circumstantial accounts of the actions in the waters about New York city. Much of the story is little more than a collection of incidents, lacking in unity. Many quotations from original documents are given but the sources are not pointed out.

The Buffalo Historical Society has brought out a volume (*Publications*, vol. XVIII.) bearing the title *Peace Episodes on the Niagara, with Other Studies and Reports*. That which gives the book its principal title is a group of papers by Mr. Frank H. Severance. The first of these is an extended account of the conference at Niagara Falls in 1914 to deal with the Mexican situation. The second concerns the attempt by a group of Confederates in 1864, through the instrumentality of Horace Greeley, to bring about peace negotiations. The third paper, entitled "Niagara's Consecration to Peace", relates to the Catholic church, "Our Lady of Peace", situated on the Canadian side above the cataract. A fourth paper gives a history, with a number of the documents, of Ephraim Douglass's peace mission to the Indians in 1783. The fifth and last paper of the series is an address, delivered on several occasions, entitled "The Centenary of Peace in relation to the Region of the Niagara and the Great Lakes". The other papers are: a history, by Joseph Elkinton, of the Quaker mission among the Indians of New

York state, beginning in 1790 and extending through more than a century; Notes on the Literature of the War of 1812, by F. H. Severance; an account, by the same author, of the Case of Brigadier-General Alexander Smyth, who was in command of troops in the region of Buffalo, 1812–1813, including his letters and proclamations; and, lastly, a translation, by H. F. De Puy, of Rev. Louis Bridel's *Le Poür et Le Contre: ou Avis à ceux qui se proposent de passer dans les États-Unis d'Amérique,* a book published in Paris in 1803 and now rare. The volume also includes the proceedings of the Buffalo Historical Society at its fifty-second annual meeting, January, 1914.

The *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society for July and October, 1914 (third series, vol. IX., no. 1), contains an appreciative sketch of the life and historical work of the late William Nelson, for many years corresponding secretary of the society.

The new Pennsylvania Historical Commission established by act of 1913 and charged with the duty of marking and preserving antiquities and historical landmarks of Pennsylvania, has made its report (pp. 41), in the nature of a survey of the work lying within the field of the commission; an appendix presents a list of historical sites in Pennsylvania, marked and to be marked.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has recently acquired the papers of the late Jay Cooke, comprising 37,850 manuscripts, with books, pamphlets, and broadsides, presented by his heirs.

The *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for April contains an article by Dr. Amandus Johnson on John Classon Rising, the Last Director of New Sweden on the Delaware, and prints the Narrative or Journal of Captain John Ferdinand Dalziel Smyth, of the Queen's Rangers. This is the "Dr. Smith" who was arrested in December, 1775, and imprisoned in Philadelphia by order of the Continental Congress. His narrative, dated December 25, 1777, concerns his journey through Maryland, his arrest, and imprisonment. Another document of interest is "The Case of the Proprietors of Pensylvania, etc., about the Appointing of a new Deputy-Governor", relating to the removal of Sir William Keith as deputy-governor.

The Americana Germanica Press has brought out a substantial volume (pp. 386) entitled *Beliefs and Superstitions of the Pennsylvania Germans,* the work of Edwin M. Fogel, Ph.D. An introduction of some twenty pages includes a discussion of the contents of the volume and a treatment of the cultural conditions of the Pennsylvania Germans.

The great seal of the province of Maryland, lately discovered in London in the hands of a dealer in antiques, has been acquired by the state and placed in the custody of the Maryland Historical Society. Mr. Mendes Cohen has presented to the society a remarkable collection of letters and documents of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, containing about 700 separate items.

The March number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains an account of the interesting cruise of the *Clarence, Tacony,* and *Archer,* three vessels successively used in a commerce-destroying cruise, June 6–27, 1863, by Lieutenant Charles W. Read of the Confederate navy. The account is by "an officer of the United States navy, with addenda by an officer of the three vessels", the latter officer being E. H. Browne. "Seafaring in Time of War, 1756–1763", by Helen West Ridgely, relates some experiences at sea, including imprisonment, of members of the Ridgely family. The materials are drawn principally from family papers. There is a second installment of Taney's letters to Van Buren, 1860, and the Letters of Rev. Jonathan Boucher are continued.

Dr. G. M. Brumbaugh of Washington will shortly bring out volume I. of *Maryland Records: Colonial, Revolutionary, County, and Church.* An especial feature of the volume is 139 facsimile pages of the census of 1776. A second volume, containing church records of Prince George's, Charles, Frederick, and Montgomery counties, and of the District of Columbia, is in course of preparation.

The Heritage of the South: a History of the Introduction of Slavery, its Establishment from Colonial Times, and final Effect upon the Politics of the United States (pp. 119), is the work of General Jubal A. Early, written at the close of the Civil War but only now published (Lynchburg, Brown-Morrison Company). There is an introduction by R. H. Early.

The Financial Administration of the Colony of Virginia, by Percy Scott Flippin, Ph.D. (*Johns Hopkins University Studies,* series XXXIII., no. 2), constitutes a chapter of a monograph on the Royal Government in Virginia, which the author is preparing. In addition to describing the revenue system and its operation, including the personnel of its administration, the author discusses at some length the influence which the British merchants exercised upon the financial administration of the colony. Besides printed sources the author has used transcripts from the British archives in the Library of Congress, the Virginia State Library, the Virginia Historical Society, and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

In the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for April Mr. David I. Bushnell, jr., begins a study of the Virginia Frontier in History, 1778, with a paper, largely documentary, upon the Southwestern Area. A group of letters (1735–1742) from Edward Athawes, a merchant of London, to John, Charles, and Landon Carter of Virginia particularly illustrate the tobacco business in that period; a letter of Thomas Adams, November, 1774, relates to the dispute with England; some letters from John Allen to Theodorick Bland, 1779, are concerned with the matter of provisioning the prisoners from Burgoyne's army; and four letters from Mrs. Lucy Ambler, 1820–1823, are interesting for their glimpses of domestic life.

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* prints in the April number some letters of Armistead T. Mason, three of which, written from Washington in January, 1817, relate principally to office seeking. They are contributed by Miss Kate Mason Rowland. The extracts from the diary of Edmund Ruffin in this issue include a visit to Washington, February 13–23, 1857, and give interesting glimpses of politics and politicians, notably a characterization of Sam Houston. Among miscellaneous letters are: a letter of Edward F. Tayloe to T. W. Gilmer, Oct. 10, 1840, and three letters to John Tyler in February and March, 1861, from Robert C. Winthrop, James Buchanan, and J. M. Mason, respectively.

A *History of Preston County, West Virginia,* in two volumes, by O. F. Morton, is published in Kingwood, West Virginia, by the *Journal* Publishing Company.

The *Proceedings and Addresses* of the fifteenth annual session (December, 1914) of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina (1915, pp. 150) contains the record of a very profitable discussion on the making of county histories, by various students, and a paper on the North Carolina historians, by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks.

The Georgia Historical Society will bring out during the year a portion of the manuscripts of Benjamin Hawkins, member of the Continental Congress from North Carolina, 1781–1784, 1786–1787, United States Senator, 1790–1795, and Indian agent of the United States in 1785 and from 1796 to 1816. The society's *Annals* for the year ending February, 1915, have just appeared.

The Bureau of American Ethnology has published as Bulletin 46 (Washington, 1915, pp. 1614) *A Dictionary of the Choctaw Language,* by Rev. Cyrus Byington (1793–1868), missionary to that tribe.

In the April number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* W. W. Pierson presents a study of the case of Texas *v.* White, Professor James E. Winston writes a paper on New York and the Independence of Texas, drawing materials largely from newspapers, and Professor Frederic L. Paxson discourses upon the Constitution of Texas, 1845, in the making.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Society held its semi-annual meeting at New Orleans about April 21; Dr. Dunbar Rowland of Mississippi was elected president.

The first number (March) of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine,* the new organ of the Tennessee Historical Society, has made its appearance. In 1896 the society inaugurated the publication of the *American Historical Magazine,* under the editorship of Professor W. R. Garrett, who was succeeded six years later by Mr. A. V. Goodpasture. But in 1904 the magazine fell by the wayside. The editor of the new maga-

zine is St. George L. Sioussat, professor of history in Vanderbilt University. The rich stores of historical materials possessed by the Tennessee Historical Society and in the state archives offer an exceptionally fine field for such a journal, and the scholarship and efficiency of Professor Sioussat are guarantees of its editorial conduct. This first number contains two body articles: "Colonel Burr's First Brush with the Law", an account by W. E. Beard of the proceedings in Kentucky against Aaron Burr in the autumn of 1806, and the first installment of a monograph on the Indian Policy of the Federal Government and the Economic Development of the Southwest, 1789–1801, by Donald L. McMurry. In a section devoted to documents is printed the journal of General Daniel Smith, August, 1779, to July, 1780, as commissioner of Virginia for running the boundary line between North Carolina and Virginia. Inasmuch as this boundary line, separating Virginia and Kentucky on the one side from North Carolina and Tennessee on the other, has remained a subject of controversy and litigation even to our own time, this journal possesses not only historical but also prime practical importance. The journal is clarified by the editor's introduction and annotations. A briefer document is Lieutenant M. McKenzie's journal of his reconnoissance of Mobile Bay, January 5–14, 1815, contributed by Mr. John H. DeWitt, president of the Tennessee Historical Society.

A bill was introduced at the recent session of the Tennessee legislature for the establishment of a department of archives and history. It is now understood, however, that because of pressure of business at the close of the session the bill was not brought to a final vote.

The January–March number of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* consists of a third selection of letters from the Oran Follett collection belonging to the society. (Previous selections from this collection appeared in the *Quarterly*, vol. V., no. 2, and vol. IX., no. 3.) The letters in this group are chiefly from Joshua R. Giddings to Oran Follett, 1843–1847. A letter from the committee of correspondence for the Whig Convention of Massachusetts to Giddings, June 25, 1845, is of interest. The letter is signed by S. C. Phillips, Charles Allen, and C. F. Adams. Annotations, chiefly biographical, are furnished by Miss L. Belle Hamlin.

The *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for April contains the following papers: the Aaron Burr Conspiracy in the Ohio Valley, by Miss Leslie Henshaw; the Evolution of Sandusky County, by Basil Meek; the West in American History, by John Lee Webster, president of the Nebraska Historical Society; and Isaac Newton Walter, Pioneer Preacher of Ohio, by Byron R. Long.

To arrange for an historical and educational celebration of the Indiana Centennial in 1916 the governor of the state has appointed an Indiana Historical Commission of eight members, including Professor

J. A. Woodburn of Indiana University and Professor Harlow Lindley of Earlham College, the latter being secretary of the commission. Among its functions will be that of publishing documentary and other materials on the history of the state.

The article of chief importance in the March number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* is by William O. Lynch on the Flow of Colonists to and from Indiana before the Civil War.

The first volume of the *British Series* of the *Illinois Historical Collections*, edited by Professors C. W. Alvord and C. E. Carter, has just appeared. It comes down into the year 1765 and bears the subtitle "The Critical Period". The second volume, bearing the subtitle "Occupation and Trade", will be ready for distribution in July. Volume XV. of the *Collections*, a report upon county archives, by Dr. Theodore C. Pease, is also in press. Progress is being made in the preparation for the press of the George Rogers Clark papers recently discovered in the Virginia State Library, to be edited by Professors James A. James and C. H. Ambler.

The contents of the October number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* include a paper by Professor William W. Sweet on the Methodist Episcopal Church and Reconstruction; the story of the County Seat Battles of Cass County, Illinois, by J. N. Gridley; a Sketch of the Life of Jules Leon Cottet, a Former Member of the Icarian Community, by Felicie Cottet Snider; Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln, Quincy, and the Civil War, by William H. Gay; an address on the services of General James Shields, by Archbishop Ireland; and the following letters: Abraham Lincoln to C. R. Welles, Feb. 20, 1849, Stephen A. Douglas to General James Shields, April 2, 1841, and Andrew Jackson to John Reynolds, governor of Illinois, July 16, 1831.

Under the title *The Jefferson-Lemen Compact*, in a pamphlet published by the Chicago Historical Society (pp. 59), Mr. Willard C. MacNaul presents an interesting and well-written address on the relations between Jefferson and the Baptist pioneer James Lemen in the exclusion of slavery from Illinois and the Northwest Territory, based on documents (transcripts) which are printed as appendixes.

Intending to honor Abraham Lincoln by marking as the "Lincoln Way" the route over which the young Lincoln travelled from the Indiana border to his new home in Illinois in 1830, the legislature of Illinois made an appropriation for investigation of the route. Acting under the trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library, Dr. Charles M. Thompson has prepared a report on the subject, *Investigation of the Lincoln Way* (Springfield, 1915, pp. x, 70) which, with its appendix of documents, forms a model investigation of such a topic, with careful and interesting critical use of varied sources of information.

History of the Disciples of Christ in Illinois, 1819–1914, by N. S. Haynes, is issued by the Standard Publishing Company of Cincinnati.

The Burton Historical Collection of the Detroit Public Library has recently acquired a small collection of papers, miscellaneous, but containing many valuable autographs of people connected with Detroit history, from Mr. Herbert Bowen; a number of letters from the family of C. C. Trowbridge; and, from Mr. Burton, a manuscript diary kept by one Joseph Valpey, of Salem, Massachusetts, during the War of 1812, and containing an interesting account of life in Dartmoor Prison.

The Minnesota Legislature, at its recent session, provided for the construction of a building, at the cost of $500,000, for the Minnesota Historical Society and the state archives. A site has been purchased, plans are being drawn, and construction will soon begin.

The *Iowa Social History* series, the latest venture of the State Historical Society of Iowa, has been inaugurated by the issuance of two volumes: a *History of Social Legislation in Iowa,* by Mr. John E. Briggs; and a *History of Poor Relief Legislation in Iowa,* by Dr. John L. Gillin. The third volume of Dr. C. R. Aurner's six-volume *History of Education in Iowa* will soon be put to press.

The most extensive paper in the April number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* is entitled Some Episodes in the Early History of Des Moines, being a selection from the autobiography of John A. Nash with an introduction by Dan E. Clark. Other articles are: an account, by Jacob Van der Zee, of the Half Breed Tract, a reservation laid out in 1824 for the half-breeds of the Sac and Fox nations; a sketch, by George E. Roberts, of the career of Jacob Rich (1812–1913), newspaper editor and politician in Iowa for many years; and an account of the Indians of Iowa in 1842 as related by two Friends, whose reports were published in *The Friend,* December 23 and 30, 1843, and January 20, 1844. Introductory notes to the latter article are supplied by Dan E. Clark.

The April number of the *Annals of Iowa* is a "Public Archives Number", containing the paper on the Principles of Classification of Archives, read by Miss Ethel B. Virtue in the conference of archivists at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago; a brief paper on Reciprocity in Historical Materials, by Lawrence J. Burpee of Ottawa, Canada; the third paper on the Public Archives of Iowa, by C. C. Stiles, superintendent; editorial discussion of the Iowa archives law and administration, accompanied by the new law of the state concerning archives, also a discussion of Mr. Burpee's paper, read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, on Restrictions of the Use of Historical Materials.

The *Missouri Historical Review* for April, published by the State Historical Society of Missouri, contains a paper by Dr. F. F. Stephens

on Nathaniel Patten, Pioneer Editor, who published the *Missouri Intelligencer,* the first newspaper printed west of the Mississippi River outside of St. Louis; two by F. A. Sampson, Bibliography of the Missouri Press Association, and Early Travel in Missouri; also a reprint, from Jedediah Morse's *Report on Indian Affairs* (1822), of the part relating to Harmony Mission.

The April *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library contains an interesting journal by Mrs. Lodisa Frizzell of Illinois, of a journey across the plains to California in 1852.

The *Massachusetts Magazine* for January continues the Reminiscences of Judge Francis M. Thompson, relating in particular to a journey in 1862–1863 from St. Louis up the Missouri and down the Snake and Columbia rivers to Portland and San Francisco.

The Nebraska Blue Book and Historical Register, 1915 (pp. 989), edited by Addison E. Sheldon, contains historical rosters of the principal territorial and state officials, including United States senators and representatives; a sketch of the history of Nebraska, and some 87 pages of annals; historical statements concerning the departments, institutions, etc.; an Outline of Taxation in Nebraska, 1854–1913, by W. E. Hannan; and a sketch of the state's constitutional history.

The Indian Office has just published *The Official Correspondence of James S. Calhoun while Indian Agent at Santa Fé and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in New Mexico* (pp. xiv, 554, and maps) edited by Dr. Annie H. Abel.

The contents of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* for April include Some Remarks upon the New Vancouver Journal, by F. W. Howay; the Organization and First Pastorate of the First Congregational Church of Walla Walla, Washington, by T. C. Elliott; and a discussion of the Rights of the Puget Sound Indians to Game and Fish, being an address sent to the Washington legislative session of 1915, by Dr. Charles M. Buchanan, United States Indian agent at Tulalip, Washington.

The principal articles in the December *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* are a History of the Astoria Railroad, by Leslie M. Scott; the Fur Trade in the Columbia River Basin prior to 1811, by T. C. Elliott; and the Influence of the Canadian French on the Earliest Development of Oregon, by John Minto.

A brief general survey of the archive materials in Ottawa outside the present Archives Building may be seen in the recent *Report* of the Royal Commission on the Records of the Public Departments (pp. 16).

The *Report* of the Public Archives of Canada for 1913 (pp. 304), just published, besides listing accessions, reprints the *Ordinances of the Province of Quebec* (Quebec, 1767), calendars the public letters in the

Neilson collection, 1801–1824, continues to the end of 1781 the abstracts of correspondence relating to the United States at the Affaires Étrangères, Paris, and completes the calendar of the papers of Bishop Inglis.

No. 9 in the series of *Publications of the Canadian Archives* consists of two volumes, edited by Professor E. H. Oliver of the University of Saskatchewan, entitled *The Canadian North-West: its Early Development and Legislative Records* (Ottawa, 1914, pp. 688, 689–1348, and six maps). A brief account of the constitutional development of the Prairie Provinces and of pioneer legislation in the District of Assiniboia is followed by a mass of documents relating to the Red River Colony, Assiniboia, the Northern Department of Rupert's Land, the transition to Dominion government and to the establishment of Manitoba, and the constitutional development of the northwest territories from 1869 to the establishment of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905. An important place among these documents belongs to minutes of territorial councils. The work seems to be thorough, and likely to be of much value. The accompanying maps are reproductions ranging from 1685 to 1912.

No. 10 in the same series, a work of wider scope, indeed a manual of the first importance to every user of the Dominion archives, is the first volume of a *Guide to the Documents in the Manuscript Room of the Public Archives of Canada* (Ottawa, 1914, pp. 318) prepared by Mr. David W. Parker of that establishment. The portions of the archives treated in this volume are series G and C (original collections), Q, A, B, the other transcripts from England, and the transcripts from France. Fuller calendars of some of these series have been printed in former times, but their method of publication has made them so hard to use that those who are most familiar with them will give the most hearty welcome to the present volume, which, with its successor, presents a careful descriptive list of the whole collection, orderly and systematic, and above all, provided with an excellent index.

Two papers by Professor Wilbur H. Siebert, *The Loyalist Settlements on the Gaspé Peninsula* and *The Temporary Settlements of Loyalists at Machiche, P. Q.*, which appeared in vol. VIII. of the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada,* have been issued as separates.

The annual meeting of the Ontario Historical Society was held in Toronto June 2–4. The chief addresses were those of the president, Mr. Clarance M. Warner, on the Growth of Canadian National Feeling, and of Professor George M. Wrong on the Work of Champlain.

The *Papers and Records* of the Lennox and Addington Historical Society, vol. VI. (Napanee, 1915, pp. 55), contains two articles by Walter S. Herrington, K. C., on Pioneer Life on the Bay of Quinte, and on the Courts of Requests established in Upper Canada in 1792 for the collection of small debts.

The *Report of the Provincial Archives Department* of British Columbia for the year 1913 (Victoria, 1914, pp. 134) contains many interesting historical documents, among which may be especially mentioned Vancouver's confidential report to the Admiralty on his dealings with Bodega y Quadra at Nootka in 1792, and 39 letters of Sir James Douglas, 1845–1857. As *Memoir No. I.* the Archives issues a monograph by Dr. C. F. Newcombe on *The First Circumnavigation of Vancouver Island* (pp. 69), in which the writer argues the claim of Vancouver to that distinction.

R. Büchi has contributed a volume on the *Geschichte der Panamerikanischen Bewegung* (Breslau, Kern, 1914) to Schücking and Wehberg's series of *Völkerrechtliche Monographien.*

The *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* (Cuba) continues in the September–December and January–February numbers the "Correspondencia de los Intendentes Generales de Hacienda de la Isla de Cuba con el Gobierno de España" (1749), and documents pertaining to the history of the "Gran Legión del Aguila Negra" (1830).

A volume by C. Hispano deals with *Colombia en la Guerra de Independencia, la Cuestión Venezolana* (Bogotá, Arboleda, 1914, pp. xiii, 318).

In the *Annaes da Bibliotheca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro,* vols. XXXI. and XXXII., and also separately, Senhor Eduardo de Castro e Almeida, chief conservator of the National Library of Lisbon and director of the archive concerned, has published two volumes of an *Inventario dos Documentos relativos ao Brasil existentes no Archivo de Marinha e Ultramar de Lisboa* (Rio Janeiro, Bibliotheca Nacional, 1913, 1914, pp. 653, 745). These two volumes are devoted to the *capitania* of Bahia, 1613 (practically 1731)–1762 and 1762–1786. They list 12,000 documents, summarizing the most important, or even giving full texts; and furnish most solid foundations for the colonial history of eastern Brazil.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals. C. H. Sherrill, *French Memories of Eighteenth Century America* (Scribner's Magazine, April, May); W. R. Thayer, *John Hay in Politics and Diplomacy, John Hay as Secretary of State, John Hay's Statesmanship* (Harper's Magazine, April, May, June); G. W. Goethals, *The Building of the Panama Canal,* II., III., IV. (Scribner's Magazine, April, May, June); R. F. Dixon, *Eddy's War: an Unfamiliar Chapter in Canadian History* (Canadian Magazine, May); E. Wagemann, *Die Deutschen Kolonisten in Südamerika* (Schmollers Jahrbuch, XXXIX. 1); *id., Das Deutschtum in Südamerika* (Deutsche Rundschau, March).

INDEX

AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XX

☞ *The names of contributors are printed in small capitals.* (R) *indicates that the contribution is a review*

ABBOTT, F. F., (R) Sihler's "Cicero of Arpinum", 383.

ABBOTT, W. C., (R) Macaulay's "History of England", II., III., IV., 149, 431, 662; (R) Tatham's "Puritans in Power", 198; (R) Oppenheim's "Tracts of Sir William Monson", V., 660; (R) Barbour's "Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington", 845.

ABEL, ANNIE H., (R) Eaton's "John Ross and the Cherokee Indians", 672.

"Achea, La Confederazione", by Giovanni Niccolini, reviewed, 873.

Adams, C: F., deceased, 684.

ADAMS, G: B., (R) Pasquet's "Origines de la Chambre des Communes", 139; *Magna Carta and the Responsible Ministry*, 744–760.

"Adams, John Quincy, Writings of", III., IV., by W. C. Ford, reviewed, 173, 861.

"Africa, Intervention and Colonization in", by N. D. Harris, reviewed, 663.

Alden, C. S., "George Hamilton Perkins", reviewed, 676.

Alexander, I., Letter of Kamehameha II. to (doc.), 831–833.

Alford, B. H., "Jewish History and Literature", reviewed, 381.

"Alfred in the Chroniclers", by Edward Conybeare, reviewed, 189.

Allen, P. S., "Age of Erasmus", reviewed, 428.

Altamira, Rafael, "Cuestiones de Historia del Derecho y de Legislación Comparada", reviewed, 185.

Alvord, C. W., (introd.) "The Illinois-Wabash Land Company Manuscript", reviewed, 891.

AMBLER, C: H., (R) Callahan's "History of West Virginia", 441.

Amélinean, Émile, deceased, 903.

"America, England and, Wars between", by T. C. Smith, reviewed, 433.

"American Government, Cyclopedia of", by A. C. McLaughlin and A. B. Hart, reviewed, 411.

"American Historical Association, Annual Report of the", 1912, reviewed, 184.

American Historical Association, Meeting of the, in Chicago, 503–527; social events, 503–504; former Chicago meetings, 504–505; papers on ancient history, 505–507; medieval history, 507–508; medieval England, 508–510; the transition period, 510; modern England, 511–512; Napoleonic Europe, 512–514; modern Europe, 514–515; American history, 515–518; conference of historical societies, 518–519; conference of archivists, 519–520; the business meeting, 520–525; list of officers and committees, 525–527.

"American History, Contemporary", by C: A. Beard, reviewed, 179.

American History and American Democracy, by A. C. MCLAUGHLIN, 255–276; point of view of historical study, 255–258; effect of environment on the study, 258–262; historical review, colonial period, 262–265; constitutional development, 265–

266; growth of parties, 266–268; the middle period, 268–269; slavery, 270–273; nationalism, 274–276.

"American People, Rise of the", by R. G. Usher, reviewed, 161.

"American Revolution, the West in the Diplomacy of", by P. C. Phillips, reviewed, 671.

"Americans in the Philippines", by J. A. LeRoy, reviewed, 181.

"American Society of Church History, Papers of the", 2 ser., IV., by W: W. Rockwell, reviewed, 841.

Ancient Culture, Economic Basis of the Decline of, by W: L. Westermann, 723–743.

Andrews, C: M., *Colonial Commerce,* 43–63; (introd.) "Colonising Activities of the English Puritans", reviewed, 146; "Guide to the Public Record Office", II., reviewed, 418; *Anglo-French Commercial Rivalry, 1700–1750,* I., II., 539–556, 761–780; (R) "Correspondence during Jonathan Law's Governorship of Connecticut", 859; (ed.) "Narratives of the Insurrections", reviewed, 888.

Anglican Outlook on the American Colonies in the Early Eighteenth Century, by E. B. Greene, 64–85; weakness of church in the colonies, 64–65; the S. P. G., 66–67; missionary activities, 67–70; objects, 71–76; attitude toward Quakers, 77–78; toward dissenters, 78–82; administration of colonial church, 83–85.

Anglo-French Commercial Rivalry, I., II., by C: M. Andrews, 539–556, 761–780; Portuguese, Spanish, and Dutch trade, 539–543; English attack on Dutch, 543–546; fisheries and fur, 546–548; trade of tropical colonies, 549–556; growth of French sugar trade, 761–766; appeal to Parliament, 766–772; bill of 1733, 773–776; measures of 1739–1752, 776–780.

"Anthracite Coal Combination in the United States", by Eliot Jones, reviewed, 871.

"Applied History", II., by B. F. Shambaugh, reviewed, 896.

"Archéologie Préhistorique Celtique et Gallo-Romaine, Manuel d'", II., by Joseph Déchelette, reviewed, 380.

"Architecture and the Allied Arts", by A. M. Brooks, reviewed, 186.

"Archivo General de Simancas", by Julián Paz, reviewed, 878.

"Arlington, Henry Bennet, Earl of", by Violet Barbour, reviewed, 845.

"Armée Royale au Temps de Philippe Auguste, L'", by Édouard Audouin, reviewed, 191.

Arthur, J. P., "Western North Carolina", reviewed, 890.

"Artilleryman's Diary, An", by J. L. Jones, reviewed, 210.

Asakawa, K., *Origin of Feudal Land Tenure in Japan,* 1–23.

Audouin, Édouard, "L' Armée Royale au Temps de Philippe Auguste", reviewed, 191.

Aurner, C. R., "History of Education in Iowa", reviewed, 897.

Babcock, K. C:, "Scandinavian Element in the United States", reviewed, 895; (R) Aurner's "History of Education in Iowa", 897.

Baldwin, J. F., *Concilium and Consilium,* 330–333.

"Balkans, La Guerre des", by Gabriel Hanotaux, reviewed, 160.

"Balkans, The", by W: M. Sloane, reviewed, 410.

"Balkan Wars, Report of the International Commission on the", reviewed, 638.

Ballagh, J. C., (ed.), "Letters of Richard Henry Lee", II., reviewed, 645.

"Baltic, English Trade in the", by Neva R. Deardorff, reviewed, 144.

Bancroft, H. H., "Retrospection", reviewed, 211; "The New Pacific", reviewed, 211.

Bannister, H. M., (ed.), "Collectanea Franciscana", reviewed, 193.

Barbour, Violet, "Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington", reviewed, 845.

Barrows, D. P., (R) LeRoy's "Americans in the Philippines", 181.

"Bartolus of Sassoferrato", by C. N. S. Woolf, reviewed, 192.

"Bartolus on the Conflict of Laws", by J. H: Beale, reviewed, 876.
Beale, J. H:, (transl.) "Bartolus on the Conflict of Laws", reviewed, 876.
Beard, C: A., "Contemporary American History", reviewed, 179.
"Beauchamp, Richard, Pageant of the Life of", by Viscount Dillon and W. H. St. J. Hope, reviewed, 195.
Below, G. von, "Der Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters", reviewed, 137.
"Beneventan Script", by E. A. Loew, reviewed, 133.
"Bennet, Henry, Earl of Arlington", by Violet Barbour, reviewed, 845.
"Bentley, William, Diary of", IV., reviewed, 208.
Bickley, Francis, "The Cavendish Family", reviewed, 396.
"Bismarck, Fürst", by Hermann Hofmann, reviewed, 854.
"Blaeu, Willem Janszoon, 1571–1638", by E: L. Stevenson, reviewed, 659.
Blakeslee, G: H., "Latin America: Clark University Addresses", reviewed, 679.
Blanco-Fombona, R., (ed.) "Discursos y Proclamas", reviewed, 213.
Bland, A. E., (ed.) "English Economic History", reviewed, 621.
Blok, P. J., "Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk", II., reviewed, 878.
Boak, A. E. R., (R) Niccolini's "La Confederazione Achea", 873.
Bolívar, Simón, "Discursos y Proclamas", reviewed, 213.
Bolton, H. E., (ed.) "Athanase de Mézières and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier", reviewed, 168.
Boone, Henderson and: Creative Forces in Westward Expansion, by Archibald Henderson, 86–107.
Bourne, H: E., (R) Caron's "Paris pendant la Terreur", II., 201; (R) Madelin's "Danton", 202; (R) Chuquet's "Dumouriez", 431; "The Revolutionary Period in Europe", reviewed, 848.
Boyd, C: W., (ed.) "Mr. Chamberlain's Speeches", reviewed, 884.
Boyd, W: K., (R) Hamilton's "Reconstruction in North Carolina", 869.
Boyen's Military Law, by G. S. Ford, 528–538; importance of the army in German history, 528–529; the army of the Great Elector, 530–531; the secularizing of the army, 531; work of Stein and Scharnhorst, 532–535; Boyen's law, 535–538.
Bradford, Gamaliel, "Confederate Portraits", reviewed, 177; *A Portrait of General George Gordon Meade*, 314–329.
Bresslau, Harry, "Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien", II., reviewed, 875.
"British Empire and the United States", by W: A. Dunning, reviewed, 648.
"British Radicalism", by W. P. Hall, reviewed, 880.
Brock, R. A., deceased, 217.
Brom, Abbé Gisbert, deceased, 903.
Bronson, W. C., "History of Brown University", reviewed, 669.
Brooks, A. M., "Architecture and the Allied Arts", reviewed, 186.
Brown, P. A., (ed.) "English Economic History", reviewed, 621.
Brown, P. H., "Legislative Union of England and Scotland", reviewed, 661.
Brown, P. M., (R) Hunt's "Department of State", 642.
Browning, C: H., "Welsh Settlement of Pennsylvania", reviewed, 666.
"Brown University, History of", by W. C. Bronson, reviewed, 669.
Bruce, P. A., (R) Wertenbaker's "Virginia under the Stuarts", 163.
Bryan, W. B., "History of the National Capital", I., reviewed, 421.
Bryce, Viscount James, (introd.) "A Great Peace Maker", reviewed, 864.
Buckle, G: E., "Life of Disraeli", III., reviewed, 635.
"Bull Run", by R. M. Johnston, reviewed, 174.
Burnett, E. C., (introd. to doc.) *Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780–1782*, I., 341–376; (R) Hunt's "Journals of the Continental Congress", XXII., XXIII., 670.

Burr, G: L., (ed.) "Narratives of the Witchcraft Case", reviewed, 164; (R) Jones's "Spiritual Reformers", 624; (R) Stevenson's "Willem Janszoon Blaeu", 659.
Burrage, H: S., "The Beginnings of Colonial Maine", reviewed, 205.
Butler, G: G., (ed.) "Journal of the Seven Years' War", reviewed, 627.
Butler, J. R. M., "The Passing of the Great Reform Bill", reviewed, 203.

Cabinet, Relation of Magna Carta to, by G: B. Adams, 744–760.
"California, Establishment of State Government in", by Cardinal Goodwin, reviewed, 441.
Calkins, C. G., (R) Newton's "Colonizing Activities of the English Puritans", 146.
Callahan, J. M., "Semi-Centennial History of West Virginia", reviewed, 441.
Callender, G. S., (R) "Commerce of Rhode Island", I., 857.
Campardon, L. E., deceased, 903.
"Canada, Fall of", by G: M. Wrong, reviewed, 898.
"Capital, National, History of the", I., by W. B. Bryan, reviewed, 421.
Caron, Pierre, (ed.) "Paris pendant la Terreur", II., reviewed, 201.
Carter, C. E., (introd. to doc.) *Observations of Superintendent John Stuart and Governor James Grant on the Plan of 1764 for the Management of Indian Affairs*, 815–831.
Case, S. J., "Evolution of Early Christianity", reviewed, 616.
"Catholic Refugees on the Continent, English", I., by Peter Guilday, reviewed, 394.
Catterall, R. C: H:, deceased, 217.
"Cavendish Family", by Francis Bickley, reviewed, 396.
"Cavour and the Making of Modern Italy", by Pietro Orsi, reviewed, 204.
"Cavour e Mélanie Waldor", by Francesco Ruffini, reviewed, 154.
"Cecil Family", by G. R. Dennis, reviewed, 396.
Chace, H: R., "Maps of Providence, R. I.", reviewed, 206; "Owners and Occupants of the Lots, Houses, and Shops in Providence, R. I.", reviewed, 206.
"Chamberlain's, Mr., Speeches", by C: W. Boyd, reviewed, 884.
Champion, E., deceased, 903.
Champlain Society, Publications of the, VIII., 665.
Channing, Edward, *Kentucky Resolutions of 1798*, 333–336.
"Chartisme, Le", by Édouard Dolléans, reviewed, 406.
Cheney, E: P., (R) Hall's "Bibliography of English Medieval Economic History", 134; (R) Bland, Brown, and Tawney's "English Economic History", 621.
"Cherokee Indians, John Ross and the", by Rachel C. Eaton, reviewed, 672.
Chicago, Meeting of the American Historical Association in, 503–527.
"Christianity, Evolution of Early", by S. J. Case, reviewed, 616.
Christie, F. A., (R) Case's "Evolution of Early Christianity", 616; (R) Taylor's "Deliverance", 838; (R) McGiffert's "Rise of Modern Religious Ideas", 882.
"Christ's College, Biographical Register of", by John Peile, reviewed, 430.
"Chronica Johannis de Reading", by James Tait, reviewed, 194.
Chuquet, Arthur, "Dumouriez", reviewed, 431.
Church, Anglican, Outlook of on the American Colonies, by E. B. Greene, 64–85.
"Church History, Guide to the Study of", by W. J. McGlothlin, reviewed, 656.
"Church History, Papers of the American Society of", 2 ser., IV., by W: W. Rockwell, reviewed, 841.
"Cicero of Arpinum", by E. G. Sihler, reviewed, 383.
Civil War, Russian Fleet and the, by F. A. Golder, 801–814.
Clark, G: L., "History of Connecticut", reviewed, 420.

Coker, F. W., (R) Smith's "Harrington and his Oceana", 399.
Cole, A. C:, "The Whig Party in the South", reviewed, 649.
"Collectanea Franciscana", by A. G. Little, M. R. James, and H. M. Bannister, reviewed, 193.
Colonial Commerce, by C: M. Andrews, 43–63; importance of the subject, 43–47; England's commercial policy, 47–48; relation of colonies to this policy, 48–52; importance of commerce to the colonies, 52–55; staple products, 55–56; shipping, 56–58; routes, 58–61; illegal trade, 61–63.
"Colonial Trade of Maryland", by Margaret S. Morriss, reviewed, 667.
Colonies, American, Anglican Outlook on in the Early Eighteenth Century, by E. B. Greene, 64–85.
"Colonising Activities of the English Puritans", by A. P. Newton, reviewed, 146.
"Columbia Historical Society, Records of the", XVII., reviewed, 207.
Coman, Katharine, deceased, 685.
Commerce, Colonial, by C: M. Andrews, 43–63.
"Commerce of Rhode Island", I., reviewed, 857.
"Communes, Les Origines de la Chambre des", by D. Pasquet, reviewed, 139.
Concilium and Consilium, by J. F. Baldwin, 330–333.
"Confederate Portraits", by Gamaliel Bradford, reviewed, 177.
Conger, Capt. A. L., (R) King's "True Ulysses S. Grant", 675.
"Connecticut, Correspondence during Jonathan Law's Governorship of", reviewed, 859.
"Connecticut, History of", by G: L. Clark, reviewed, 420.
"Connecticut Historical Society, Collections of the", XV., reviewed, 859.
"Continental Congress, Journals of the", XXII., XXIII., by Gaillard Hunt, reviewed, 670.
Conybeare, Edward, "Alfred in the Chroniclers", reviewed, 189.
"Copley, John Singleton, Letters and Papers of", reviewed, 643.
Corbett, J. S., "Private Papers of George, second Earl Spencer", II., reviewed, 850.
Cotton Factorage System of the Southern States, by A. H. Stone, 557–565; the system in the West Indies, 557–558; functions of the Southern factor, 559–560; his profits, 561–563; effects of the system, 563–565.
Courteault, Paul, (ed.) "Commentaires de Blaise de Monluc", II., reviewed, 197.
Cox, I. J., (R) Bolton's "Athanase de Mézières", 168.
Cowan, A. R., "Master-Clues in World-History", reviewed, 423.
Creative Forces in Westward Expansion: Henderson and Boone, by Archibald Henderson, 86–107; Boone's rôle, 86–88; colonizing spirit, 88–89; various colonizing movements, 90–96; early life of Boone, 96–98; Richard Henderson and Company, 99–102; Boone's visits to Kentucky, 103–107.
Cross, A. L., (R.) Bickley's "Cavendish Family", 396; (R) Dennis's "Cecil Family", 396; (R) Locke's "Seymour Family", 396; (R) Stephens's "La Tremoïlle Family", 396; "History of England", reviewed, 620; (R) Brown's "Legislative Union of England and Scotland", 661; (R) Fouché's "Diary of Adam Tas", 662.
"Cuestiones de Historia del Derecho y de Legislación Comparada", by Rafael Altamira, reviewed, 185.
Curtis, E: E., (R) Smith's "Wars between England and America", 433.
"Customary Acres and their Historical Importance", by Frederic Seebohm, reviewed, 618.
"Cyclopedia of American Government", by A. C. McLaughlin and A. B. Hart, reviewed, 411.

"Danton", by Louis Madelin, reviewed, 202.
"Dartmouth College, History of", II., by J: K. Lord, reviewed, 436.

Davenport, Frances G., (R) "Transactions of the Royal Historical Society", 3 ser., VIII., 655.
Davis, H. A., "The Judicial Veto", reviewed, 432.
Deardorff, Neva R., "English Trade in the Baltic under Elizabeth", reviewed, 144.
Déchelette, Joseph, "Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique Celtique et Gallo-Romaine", II., reviewed, 380; deceased, 685.
"De Forest, Jesse, Journal of", by Mrs. Robert W. De Forest, reviewed, 856.
De Forest, Mrs. Robert W., "A Walloon Family in America", reviewed, 856.
"Deity, Roman Ideas of", by W. W. Fowler, reviewed, 840.
"Delaware, Colonial Mansions of Maryland and", by J: M. Hammond, reviewed, 668.
"Deliverance", by H: O. Taylor, reviewed, 838.
Dennis, A. L. P., (R) Williamson's "Maritime Enterprise", 658; (R) Sainsbury's "Calendar of East India Company Minutes, 1650–1654", 844; (R) Foster's "English Factories in India, 1646–1650", 879; (R) Scott's "Life of Captain Matthew Flinders", 881.
Dennis, G. R., "The Cecil Family", reviewed, 396.
"Department of State of the United States", by Gaillard Hunt, reviewed, 642.
"Derecho, Historia del", by Rafael Altamira, reviewed, 185.
Despréaux, Frignet, "Le Maréchal Mortier", reviewed, 404.
"Deutschamerikanische Farmer", by Joseph Och, reviewed, 209.
"Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois, Jahrbuch der", by Julius Goebel, reviewed, 170.
"Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters, Der", by G. von Below, reviewed, 137.
"Deutschland, Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für", by Harry Bresslau, reviewed, 875.
Dillon, Viscount, (ed.) "Pageant of the Life of Richard Beauchamp", reviewed, 195.
"Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe, History of", III., by D. J. Hill, reviewed, 401.
"Discursos y Proclamas", by Simón Bolívar, reviewed, 213.
"Disraeli, Benjamin, Life of", III., by W: F. Monypenny and G: E. Buckle, reviewed, 635.
Doctoral dissertations, 484, 722.
Dodd, W: E., (R) Cole's "Whig Party in the South", 649.
Dolléans, Édouard, "Le Chartisme", reviewed, 406.
Douais, Monsignor, deceased, 903.
Doughty, A. G., (ed.) "Journal of the Campaigns in North America, 1757–1760", I., reviewed, 665.
Douglas, S. O. G., "Theory of Civilization", reviewed, 654.
Douglas-Lithgow, R. A., "Nantucket", reviewed, 437.
Dow, G: F., (ed.) "Records of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Mass.", III., reviewed, 207.
"Dumouriez", by Arthur Chuquet, reviewed, 431.
Duncalf, Frederic, (R) Robinson's "Life of Saint Severinus by Eugippius", 874.
Dunning, W: A., "The British Empire and the United States", reviewed, 648.
Dutcher, G: M., (R) Montarlot and Pingaud's "Congrès de Rastatt", III., 151; (R) Oman's "Peninsular War", V., 851.

"East India Company, Calendar of the Court Minutes of, 1650–1654", by Ethel B. Sainsbury, reviewed, 844.
Eaton, Rachel C., "John Ross and the Cherokee Indians", reviewed, 672.
Economic Basis of the Decline of Ancient Culture, by W. L. Westermann, 723–743; causes usually assigned, 723–726; theory of the loss of gold, 726–729; decline of population, 729–730; effect of slavery, 730–

731; faults in current ideas, 731–732; development of Roman administrative policy, 732–734; Greek trade, 734–736; Egyptian industrial history, 737–738; industrial development of Rome, 739–743.

"Education in Iowa, History of", by C. A. Aurner, reviewed, 897.

"Edward II. in English History", by T. F. Tout, reviewed, 388.

"Egypt, Governors and Judges of", by Rhuvon Guest, reviewed, 657.

"Elizabeth, English Trade in the Baltic during the Reign of", by Neva R. Deardorff, reviewed, 144.

"Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America", by S. C. Johnson, reviewed, 200.

"England, History of", by A. L. Cross, reviewed, 620.

"England, History of", by Lord Macaulay, II., III., IV., reviewed, 149, 431, 662.

"England, History of the Church of", by H: O. Wakeman, reviewed, 425.

"England and America, Wars between", by T. C. Smith, reviewed, 433.

"England and Scotland, Legislative Union of", by P. H. Brown, reviewed, 661.

"English Catholic Refugees on the Continent", I., by Peter Guilday, reviewed, 394.

"English Commerce in the Tudor Period", reviewed, 144.

"English Economic History", by A. E. Bland, P. A. Brown, R. H. Tawney, reviewed, 621.

"English Factories in India, 1646–1650", by William Foster, reviewed, 879.

"English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries", by F. E. Harmer, reviewed, 875.

"English Industries of the Middle Ages", by L. F. Salzmann, reviewed, 136.

"English Mediaeval Economic History, Bibliography of", by Hubert Hall, reviewed, 134.

"English Trade in the Baltic during the Reign of Elizabeth", by Neva R. Deardorff, reviewed, 144.

"English Trading Expeditions under the Muscovy Company", by E. V. Vaughn, reviewed, 144.

"Erasmus, Age of", by P. S. Allen, reviewed, 428.

"Essays, Political and Historical", by Charlemagne Tower, reviewed, 664.

"Essex County, Mass., Records of the Quarterly Courts of", III., by G: F. Dow, reviewed, 207.

"Eugippius, Life of Saint Severinus by", by G: W. Robinson, reviewed, 874.

"Europe, Confederation of", by W. A. Phillips, reviewed, 153.

Ewald, Wilhelm, "Siegelkunde", reviewed, 426.

Fame of Sir Edward Stafford, by Conyers Read, 292–313; Stafford's family connections, 292–293; his alliance with Burleigh, 294–296; his ambassadorship, 296; enmity of Walsingham, 297–299; Rogers's report, 299–301; testimony of Mendoza, 301–307; Stafford's debts, 308–311; knowledge of his treachery, 312–313.

"Farini, Luigi Carlo", by Luigi Messedaglia, reviewed, 156.

"Farini, Luigi Carlo, Epistolario de", by Luigi Rava, reviewed, 156.

Faust, A. B., (R) Goebel's "Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft", 170; (R) Och's "Der Deutschamerikanische Farmer", 209.

Fay, S. B., (R) Holland's "Germany", 189; (R) Hill's "History of Diplomacy", III., 401; (R) Temperley's "Frederick the Great", 846; (R) Ulmann's "Geschichte der Befreiungskriege", I., 853.

Ferguson, W: S., (R) Pareti's "Studi Siciliani ed Italioti", 378.

"Feudalism in Scotland", by H. B. King, reviewed, 427.

Feudal Land Tenure in Japan, Origin of the, by K. Asakawa, 1–23.

"Financing of the Hundred Years' War", by S. B. Terry, reviewed, 877.

Firth, C: H., (ed.) Macaulay's "History of England", II., III., IV., reviewed, 149, 431, 662.

Fish, C. R., (R) "A Great Peace Maker: Diary of James Gallatin", 864; (R) Babcock's "Scandinavian Element in the United States", 895.

Fitzpatrick, E: A., (R) Shambaugh's "Applied History", II., 896.

Fitzpatrick, J. C., (ed.) "Calendar of the Correspondence of George Washington", reviewed, 892.

"Flinders, R. N., Captain Matthew, Life of", by Ernest Scott, reviewed, 881.

Fling, F. M., (R) Bourne's "Revolutionary Period in Europe", 848.

Ford, G. S., *Boyen's Military Law*, 528–538.

Ford, H: J., "The Scotch-Irish in America", reviewed, 886.

Ford, W. C., (ed.) "Writings of John Quincy Adams", III., IV., reviewed, 173, 861.

Foster, H. D., (R) "Registres du Conseil de Genève", V., 429.

Foster William, (introd.) "Calendar of Minutes of East India Company", reviewed, 844; (ed.) "English Factories in India, 1646–1650", reviewed, 879.

Fouché, Leo, (ed.) "Diary of Adam Tas", reviewed, 662.

Fowler, W. W., "Roman Ideas of Deity in the Last Century before the Christian Era", reviewed, 840.

"Fox, Charles, George the Third and", by Sir G: O. Trevelyan, II., reviewed, 629.

"Franciscana, Collectanea", by A. G. Little, M. R. James, and H. M. Bannister, reviewed, 193.

Franciscan Studies, British Society of, V., reviewed, 193.

Frank, Tenney, "Roman Imperialism", reviewed, 131.

"Frederick the Great and Kaiser Joseph", by Harold Temperley, reviewed, 846.

"French Revolution in San Domingo", by T. L. Stoddard, reviewed, 678.

Fryer, C: E., (R) Butler's "Passing of the Great Reform Bill", 203.

"Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana", by Heinrich Hagenmeyer, reviewed, 623.

"Gallatin, James, Diary of", reviewed, 864.

Garrett, M. B., (R) Stoddard's "French Revolution in San Domingo", 678.

Gay, H. N., (R) Ruffini's "Cavour e Mélanie Waldor", 154; (R) Messedaglia's "Luigi Carlo Farini", 156; (R) Rava's "Epistolario di Luigi Carlo Farini", 156.

"Genève, Registres du Conseil de", V., reviewed, 429.

"George the Third and Charles Fox", II., by Sir G: O. Trevelyan, reviewed, 629.

"Germany", by A. W. Holland, reviewed, 189.

"Germany, Reformation in", by H: C. Vedder, reviewed, 390.

Gerson, A. J., "Organization of the Muscovy Company", reviewed, 144.

"Geschichte der Befreiungskriege", I., by Heinrich Ulmann, reviewed, 853.

Ghent, Letters relating to the Negotiations at, 1812–1814 (doc.), 108–129.

Goebel, Julius, (ed.) "Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois", reviewed, 170.

Golder, F. A., "Russian Expansion on the Pacific", reviewed, 626, 900; *Russian Fleet and the Civil War*, 801–814.

González, J. V., "Biografía de J. Félix Ribas", reviewed, 212.

Gooch, G. P., "Life of Charles Third Earl of Stanhope", reviewed, 150.

Goodell, A. C., deceased, 217.

Goodwin, Cardinal, "State Government in California", reviewed, 441.

Gould, C. P., "Money and Transportation in Maryland", reviewed, 889.

Government of Normandy under Henry II., I., II., by C: H. Haskins, 24–42, 277–291; materials for the study, 24–31; administration of justice, 31–36; judicial procedure, 36–40; ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 40–42; reorganization under Richard of Ilches-

ter, 277–279; the Norman Exchequer, 279–283; the seneschal, 283–284; local courts, 285; criminal and civil jurisdiction, 286–288; list of assizes, 289–291.

Grant, Governor James, to the Board of Trade (doc.), 827–831.

Grant, James, (ed.) "The Old Scots Navy", reviewed, 199.

"Grant, Ulysses S., The True", by Charles King, reviewed, 675.

Gray, Edward, "William Gray of Salem", reviewed, 435.

GRAY, H. L., (R) Salzmann's "English Industries of the Middle Ages", 136; (R) Seebohm's "Customary Acres", 618.

"Gray, William, of Salem, Merchant", by Edward Gray, reviewed, 435.

"Great Peace Maker: Diary of James Gallatin", reviewed, 864.

GREENE, E. B., *Anglican Outlook on the American Colonies in the Early Eighteenth Century*, 64–85.

Guest, Rhuvon, (ed.) "Governors and Judges of Egypt", reviewed, 657.

"Guiana, Voyage to", by Mrs. Robert W. De Forest, reviewed, 856.

"Guide to the Materials for American History in the Public Record Office", II., by C: M. Andrews, reviewed, 418.

Guilday, Peter, "English Catholic Refugees on the Continent", I., reviewed, 394.

Haig, R. M., "General Property Tax in Illinois", reviewed, 440.

Hagenmeyer, Heinrich, (ed.) "Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana", reviewed, 623.

Hall, Hubert, (ed.) "Select Bibliography of English Mediaeval Economic History", reviewed, 134.

HALL, W. P., (R) Dolléans' "Le Chartisme", 406; "British Radicalism", reviewed, 880.

Hamilton, J. G. de R., "Reconstruction in North Carolina", reviewed, 869.

HAMLIN, A. D. F., (R) Brooks's "Architecture and the Allied Arts", 186.

Hammond, J: M., "Colonial Mansions of Maryland and Delaware", reviewed, 668.

Hanotaux, Gabriel, "La Guerre des Balkans", reviewed, 160.

Harmer, F. E., (ed.) "English Historical Documents", reviewed, 875.

HARPER, S: N., (R) Rambaud's "Histoire de la Russie", 159.

"Harrington and his Oceana", by H. F. R. Smith, reviewed, 399.

Harris, N. D., "Intervention and Colonization in Africa", reviewed, 663.

Hart, A. B., "Cyclopedia of American Government", reviewed, 411.

HART, C: H:, (R) "Letters and Papers of Copley and Pelham", 643.

HASKINS, C: H., *The Government of Normandy under Henry II.*, I., II., 24–42, 277–291; (R) Loew's "Beneventan Script", 133; (R) Salzmann's "Henry II.", 190; (R) Ewald's "Siegelkunde", 426; (R) Hauptmann's "Wappenkunde", 426; (R) Bresslau's "Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien", 875.

Haumant, Émile, (ed.) "Histoire de la Russie", reviewed, 159.

Hauptmann, Felix, "Wappenkunde", reviewed, 426.

Hausrath, Adolf, "Treitschke", reviewed, 883.

Hawaii, Letter concerning (doc.), 831–833.

Heigel, K. T. von, deceased, 902.

HENDERSON, ARCHIBALD, *Creative Forces in American Expansion: Henderson and Boone*, 86–107; (R) Arthur's "Western North Carolina", 890.

Henderson and Boone: Creative Forces in Westward Expansion, by ARCHIBALD HENDERSON, 86–107.

Henry, H. M., "Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina", reviewed, 672.

"Henry II.", by L. F. Salzmann, reviewed, 190.

Henry II., Government of Normandy under, I., II., by C: H. HASKINS, 24–42, 277–291.

"Henry III., John and, Taxation un-

der", by S. K. Mitchell, reviewed, 385.
"Henry the Fifth, Reign of", I., by J. H. Wylie, reviewed, 143.
"Henry VII.", by Gladys Temperley, reviewed, 428.
Hill, D. J., "Diplomacy in Europe", III., reviewed, 401.
"Hindu Polity, Studies in Ancient", I., by N. N. Law, reviewed, 377.
"Historisch-Politische Aufsätze und Reden", by Hermann Oncken, reviewed, 407.
"History, Applied", II., by B. F. Shambaugh, reviewed, 896.
"History, Essays in Legal", by Paul Vinogradoff, reviewed, 836.
Hofmann, Hermann, "Fürst Bismarck", reviewed, 854.
Holland, A. W., "Germany", reviewed, 189.
Hope, W. H. St. J., (ed.) "Pageant of the Life of Richard Beauchamp", reviewed, 195.
Hopkins, E. W., (R) Law's "Ancient Hindu Polity", I., 377.
Hudson, Richard, deceased, 903.
Hulme, E: M., "Renaissance, Protestant Revolution and Catholic Reformation", reviewed, 393, 680.
"Hundred Years' War, Financing of the", by S. B. Terry, reviewed, 877.
Hunt, Gaillard, (R) Bryan's "History of the National Capital", I., 421; "Department of State of the United States", reviewed, 642; (ed.) "Journals of the Continental Congress", XXII., XXIII., reviewed, 670; "Life in America One Hundred Years Ago", reviewed, 894.
Hunt, R. D., (R) Goodwin's "State Government in California", 441.
"Hussite Wars", by Count Lützow, reviewed, 842.

"Illinois, General Property Tax in", by R. M. Haig, reviewed, 440.
"Illinois-Wabash Land Company Manuscript", by C. W. Alvord, reviewed, 891.
"Indians, Cherokee, John Ross and the", by Rachel C. Eaton, reviewed, 672.
Indians, Observations on the Plan of 1764 for Management of (doc.), 815–831.
"Indian Wars, Narratives of the", by C: H. Lincoln, reviewed, 166.
"Insurrections, Narratives of the", by C: M. Andrews, reviewed, 888.
"Iowa, History of Education in", by C. R. Aurner, reviewed, 897.
"Iowa, Quakers of", by L. T. Jones, reviewed, 210.
"Irshád Al-Aríb ilá Ma'rifat Al-Adíb", by D. S. Margoliouth, reviewed, 424.
"Italien, Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für", by Harry Bresslau, reviewed, 875.
"Italy, Cavour and the Making of Modern", by Pietro Orsi, reviewed, 204.

James, M. R., (ed.) "Collectánea Franciscana", reviewed, 193.
Japan, Origin of the Feudal Land Tenure in, by K. Asakawa, 1–23.
Jernegan, M. W., (R) Douglas-Lithgow's "Nantucket", 437.
Jewett, J. R., (R) Guest's "Governors and Judges of Egypt", 657.
"Jewish History and Literature", by B. H. Alford, reviewed, 381.
"Johannis de Reading", by James Tait, reviewed, 194.
"John and Henry III., Taxation under", by S. K. Mitchell, reviewed, 385.
Johnson, Allen, (R) Ford's "Writings of John Quincy Adams", III., IV., 173, 861.
"Johnson, Reverdy, Life of", by B. C. Steiner, reviewed, 651.
Johnson, S. C., "Emigration from the United Kingdom", reviewed, 200.
Johnston, R. M., "Bull Run", reviewed, 174; (R) "Le Maréchal Mortier", 404; (R) St. Paul's "Journal of the Seven Years' War", 627.
Jones, C: H., "Life of J. Glancy Jones", reviewed, 674.
Jones, Eliot, "Anthracite Coal Combination", reviewed, 871.
"Jones, J. Glancy, Life and Public Services of", by C: H. Jones, reviewed, 674.

Jones, J. L., "An Artilleryman's Diary", reviewed, 210.
Jones, L. T., "The Quakers of Iowa", reviewed, 210.
Jones, R. M., "Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", reviewed, 624.
Jonquière, Vicomte de la, "Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman", reviewed, 195.
Josiah, Reform of, by A. T. Olmstead, 566.
"Judicial Veto", by H. A. Davis, reviewed, 432.
Judson, Katharine B., (introd. to doc.) 833–835.
"Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, Les", by Jean Juster, reviewed, 613.
Juster, Jean, "Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain", reviewed, 613.

Kamehameha II. to Alexander I., Letter of (doc.), 831–833.
Keen, G. B., "Descendants of Jöran Kyn of New Sweden", reviewed, 442.
"Kentucky Resolutions of 1798", by Edward Channing, 333–336.
Kerner, R. J., (R) Lützow's "Hussite Wars", 842.
Kimball, Everett, (R) Andrews's "Narratives of the Insurrections", 888.
"Kindred and Clan in the Middle Ages", by Bertha S. Phillpotts, reviewed, 187.
King Charles, "The True Ulysses S. Grant", reviewed, 675.
King, H. B., "Feudalism in Scotland", reviewed, 427.
Kittredge, G: L., *James I. and Witchcraft,* 570.
Knox, John, "Journal of the Campaigns in North America, 1757–1760", I., reviewed, 665.
Koser, Reinhold, deceased, 446.
"Kyn, Jöran, Descendants of", by G. B. Keen, reviewed, 442.

Lafayette, Letters from, to Luzerne, 1780–1782, I., II. (doc.), 341–376, 577–612.
Lamprecht, Karl, deceased, 902.
Laprade, W: T:, (R) Stanhope and Gooch's "Life of Charles Third Earl of Stanhope", 150; (R) Corbett's "Papers of Earl Spencer", II., 850; (R) Hall's "British Radicalism", 880.
Larson, L. M., (R) Phillpotts's "Kindred and Clan", 187; (R) Major's "Early Wars of Wessex", 188; (R) Conybeare's "Alfred in the Chroniclers", 189; (R) Harmer's "English Historical Documents", 875.
"Latin America: Clark University Addresses", by G: H. Blakeslee, reviewed, 679.
"Law, Jonathan, Correspondence and Documents during the Governorship of", III., reviewed, 859.
Law, N. N., "Ancient Hindu Polity", I., reviewed, 377.
Learned, H: B., (R) Usher's "Rise of the American People", 161; (R) McLaughlin and Hart's "Cyclopedia of American Government", 411; *Casting Votes of the Vice-Presidents, 1789–1915,* 571–576.
"Lee, Richard Henry, Letters of", II., reviewed, 645.
Leland, W. G., (introd. to doc.) *Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780–1782,* I., II., 341–376, 577–612.
LeRoy, J. A., "The Americans in the Philippines", reviewed, 181.
Letters from Lafayette to Luzerne, 1780–1782 (doc.), I., II., 341–376, 577–612.
Letters relating to the Negotiations at Ghent, 1812–1814 (doc.), 108–129.
Levermore, C: H., (R) Burr's "Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases", 164.
"Life in America One Hundred Years Ago", by Gaillard Hunt, reviewed, 894.
Ligtenberg, Catharina, "Willem Usselinx", reviewed, 879.
Lincoln, C: H., (ed.) "Narratives of the Indian Wars", reviewed, 166.
Lindley, Harlow, (R) Jones's "Quakers of Iowa", 210.
Little, A. G., (ed.) "Collectanea Franciscana", reviewed, 193; (ed.)

"Roger Bacon Essays", reviewed, 386.
Locke, A. A., "Seymour Family", reviewed, 396.
Loew, E. A., "Beneventan Script", reviewed, 133.
"London Archives, Materials in for the History of the United States", by C: O. Paullin and F. L. Paxson, reviewed, 171.
Lord, J: K., "History of Dartmouth College", II., reviewed, 436.
LORD, R. H., (R) "Stanislas-Auguste Poniatowski", I., 403.
"Louisiana-Texas Frontier, Athanase de Mézières and the", by H. E. Bolton, reviewed, 168.
LUCAS, SIR C: P., (R) Knox's "Historical Journal", I., 665.
Lützow, Count, "The Hussite Wars", reviewed, 842.
LUNT, W: E., (R) "Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-first Year of the Reign of Henry II.", 190; (R) Marez and Sagher's "Comptes de la Ville d'Ypres de 1267 à 1389", II., 191; (R) Temperley's "Henry VII.", 428.
Luzerne, Letters from Lafayette to, 1780–1782, I., II. (doc.), 341–376, 577–612.
LYBYER, A. H., (R) Jonquière's "L'Empire Ottoman", 195.

Macalister, R. A. S., "The Philistines", reviewed, 130.
Macaulay, Lord, "History of England", II., III., IV., reviewed, 149, 431, 662.
McCall, S: W., "Life of Thomas Brackett Reed", reviewed, 652.
MACDONALD, WILLIAM, (R) Burrage's "Beginnings of Colonial Maine", 205.
McElroy, R. M., "Winning of the Far West", reviewed, 865.
McGiffert, A. C., "Rise of Modern Religious Ideas", reviewed, 882.
McGlothlin, W. J., "Guide to the Study of Church History", reviewed, 656.
MCILWAIN, C: H., (R) Tout's "Edward II. in English History", 388; (R) King's "History of Feudalism in Scotland", 427.
McIlwaine, H. R., (ed.) "Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1659/60–1693", reviewed, 887.
MCLAUGHLIN, A. C., *American History and American Democracy,* 255–276; "Cyclopedia of American Government", reviewed, 411; (R) Davis's "Judicial Veto", 432.
MCVEY, F. L., (R) Haig's "General Property Tax in Illinois", 440.
Madelin, Louis, "Figures du Passé: Danton", reviewed, 202.
Magna Carta and the Responsible Ministry, by G: B. ADAMS, 744–760; objections to conclusions of *Origins,* 744–745; Parliament's control of the king, 745–747; differences of method, 747–749; situation by 17th century, 749–751; struggles of 17th century, 751–755; impeachment, 756; 18th century struggles, 757–760.
Mahan, A. T., deceased, 445.
"Maine, Beginnings of Colonial", by H: S. Burrage, reviewed, 205.
Major, A. F., "Early Wars of Wessex", reviewed, 188.
Marez, G. des, (ed.) "Comptes de la Ville d'Ypres de 1267 à 1389", II., reviewed, 191.
Margoliouth, D. S., "The Irshád Al-Arîb ilá Ma'rifat Al-Adîb", reviewed, 424.
"Maritime Enterprise", by J. A. Williamson, reviewed, 658.
"Maryland, Colonial Trade of", by Margaret S. Morriss, reviewed, 667.
"Maryland, Money and Transportation in", by C. P. Gould, reviewed, 889.
"Maryland and Delaware, Colonial Mansions of", by J: M. Hammond, reviewed, 668.
Maspero, Jean, deceased, 903.
"Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections", LXXI., 7 ser., IX., reviewed, 643, 857.
"Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings", XLVII., reviewed, 437.
"Master-Clues in World-History", by A. R. Cowan, reviewed, 423.
Meade, General George Gordon, A Portrait of, by GAMALIEL BRADFORD, 314–329.
MERENESS, N. D., (R) Morriss's "Colonial Trade of Maryland", 667; (R)

Gould's "Money and Transportation in Maryland", 889.
MERRIMAN, R. B., (R) Altamira's "Cuestiones de Historia del Derecho", 185; (R) Courteault's "Commentaires de Blaise de Monluc", II., 197.
Messedaglia, Luigi, "Luigi Carlo Farini", reviewed, 156.
"Mexican War, History of the", by R. M. McElroy, reviewed, 865.
"Mézières, Athanase de", by H. E. Bolton, reviewed, 168.
"Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Proceedings of the", VII., by B. F. Shambaugh, 893.
Mitchell, S. K., "Taxation under John and Henry III.", reviewed, 385.
"Money and Transportation in Maryland", by C. P. Gould, reviewed, 889.
"Monluc, Blaise de, Commentaires de", II., by Paul Courteault, reviewed, 197.
"Monson, Sir William, Naval Tracts of", V., by M. Oppenheim, reviewed, 660.
MONTAGUE, G. H., (R) Jones's "Anthracite Coal Combination", 871.
Montarlot, P., (ed.) "Le Congrès de Rastatt", III., reviewed, 151.
Monypenny, W: F., "Life of Disraeli", III., reviewed, 635.
Mookerji, Radhakumud, (introd.) "Ancient Hindu Polity", I., reviewed, 377.
MOORE, C. H., (R) Fowler's "Roman Ideas of Deity", 840.
MOORE, CHARLES, (R) Phillips's "The West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution", 671.
MOORE, G: F., (R) Juster's "Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain", 613.
Morriss, Margaret S., "Colonial Trade of Maryland", reviewed, 667.
Morse, E: L., (ed.) "Samuel F. B. Morse", reviewed, 867.
"Morse, Samuel F. B.", by E: L. Morse, reviewed, 867.
"Mortier Duc de Trévise, Le Maréchal", by Frignet Despréaux, reviewed, 404.
Mowat, R. B., "Wars of the Roses, 1377–1471", reviewed, 141.
MUNRO, D. C., (R) Hagenmeyer's "Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana", 623.
MUNRO, W: B., (R) Wrong's "Fall of Canada", 898.
"Muscovy Company, English Trading Expeditions under", by E. V. Vaughn, reviewed, 144.
"Muscovy Company, Organization of the", by A. J. Gerson, reviewed, 144.

"Nantucket: a History", by R. A. Douglas-Lithgow, reviewed, 437.
"Narratives of the Insurrections", by C: M. Andrews, reviewed, 888.
"Navy, Old Scots", by James Grant, reviewed, 199.
Navy Records Society, Publications of the, XLIV., XLVII., XLVIII., reviewed, 199, 660, 850.
"Nederlandsche Volk, Geschiedenis van het", II., by P. J. Blok, reviewed, 878.
Nelson, William, deceased, 446.
Newton, A. P., "Colonising Activities of the English Puritans", reviewed, 146.
Niccolini, Giovanni, "La Confederazione Achea", reviewed, 873.
NICHOLS, E. L., (R) Morse's "Samuel F. B. Morse", 867.
Normandy under Henry II., Government of, I., II., by C: H. HASKINS, 24–42, 277–291.
Nor[illegible] R. H., "Simeon North", reviewed, 438.
Nor[illegible], S. N. D., "Simeon North", reviewed, 438.
"North, Simeon, First Official Pistol Maker of the United States", by S. N. D. North and R. H. North, reviewed, 438.
"North America, Emigration to", by S. C. Johnston, reviewed, 200.
"North America, Journal of the Campaigns in, 1757–1760", I., by John Knox, reviewed, 665.
"North Carolina, Reconstruction in", by J. G. de R. Hamilton, reviewed, 869.
"Northern Carolina, Western", by J: P. Arthur, reviewed, 890.

Och, Joseph, "Der Deutschamerikanische Farmer", reviewed, 209.
Ogg, F: A., "Daniel Webster", reviewed, 673.
Olmstead, A. T., *The Reform of Josiah and its Secular Aspects*, 566–570.
Oman, Charles, "History of the Peninsular War", V., reviewed, 851.
Oncken, Hermann, "Historisch-Politische Aufsätze und Reden", reviewed, 407.
Oppenheim, M., "Naval Tracts of Sir William Monson", V., reviewed, 660.
"Oregon Question, History of the", by R. M. McElroy, reviewed, 865.
"Original Narratives of Early American History", reviewed, 164, 166, 888.
Origin of the Feudal Land Tenure in Japan, by K. Asakawa, 1–23; value of the study, 1–2; Reform of the 7th century, 2–5; origin of the *shō*, 5–8; growth of the *shō*, 8–14; origin of the warrior class, 14–22; events of the 11th and 12th centuries, 22–23.
"Origins of the War", by J. H. Rose, reviewed, 885.
Orsi, Pietro, "Cavour and the Making of Modern Italy", reviewed, 204.
"Ottoman, Histoire de l'Empire", by Vicomte de la Jonquière, reviewed, 195.

"Pacific, New", by H. H. ncroft, reviewed, 211.
Paltsits, V. H., (R) Lincoln's "Narratives of the Indian Wars", 166.
Pareti, L., "Studi Siciliani ed Italioti", I., reviewed, 378.
"Paris pendant la Terreur", II., by Pierre Caron, reviewed, 201.
"Party Government in the United States", by W: M. Sloane, reviewed, 640.
Pasquet, D., "Origines de la Chambre des Communes", reviewed, 139.
Paterson, A. C., (transl.) "Diary of Adam Tas", reviewed, 662.
Paton, L. B., (R) Macalister's "Philistines", 130.
Paullin, C: O., (ed.) "Guide to London Archives for the History of the United States", reviewed, 171.
Paxson, F: L., (ed.) "Guide to London Archives for the History of the United States", reviewed, 171; (R) Dunning's "British Empire and the United States", 648.
Paz, Julián, "Archivo General de Simancas", reviewed, 878.
Peile, John, "Register of Christ's College", reviewed, 430.
"Pelham, Henry, Letters and Papers of", reviewed, 643.
"Peninsular War, History of the", V., by Charles Oman, reviewed, 851.
"Pennsylvania, the Keystone", by S: W. Pennypacker, reviewed, 439.
"Pennsylvania, Welsh Settlement of", by C: H. Browning, reviewed, 666.
Pennypacker, S: W., "Pennsylvania", reviewed, 439.
"Perkins, George Hamilton, Commodore U. S. N.", by C. S. Alden, reviewed, 676.
Perrot, Georges, deceased, 446.
Philbrick, F. S., (R) Vinogradoff's "Essays in Legal History", 836.
"Philippe Auguste, L'Armée Royale, au Temps de", by Édouard Audouin, reviewed, 191.
"Philippines, Americans in the", by J. A. LeRoy, reviewed, 181.
"Philistines, The", by R. A. S. Macalister, reviewed, 130.
Phillips, P. C., "The West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution", reviewed, 671.
Phillips, U. B., *Slave Crime in Virginia*, 336–340; (R) Henry's "Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina", 672.
Phillips, W. A., "Confederation of Europe", reviewed, 153.
Phillpotts, Bertha S., "Kindred and Clan in the Middle Ages", reviewed, 187.
Pignaud, L., (ed.) "Le Congrès de Rastatt", III., reviewed, 151.
Pöhlmann, Robert, deceased, 685.
"Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina", by H. M. Henry, reviewed, 672.

"Political and Sectional Influence of the Public Lands", by R. G. Wellington, reviewed, 434.
"Poniatowski, Mémoires du Roi Stanislas-Auguste", I., reviewed, 403.
PORRITT, EDWARD, (R) Monypenny and Buckle's "Life of Disraeli", III., 635.
Portrait of General George Gordon Meade, by GAMALIEL BRADFORD, 314–329; Meade's place in history, 314; his ambition, 315–316; his sense of duty, 316–317; intellectual ability, 317–320; modesty, 320–323; love of peace, 323–324; failure in dealing with men, 324–327; his family letters, 327–329.
"Providence, R. I., Map of", by H: R. Chace, reviewed, 206.
"Providence, R. I., Owners of Lots, Houses, and Shops", by H: R. Chace, reviewed, 206.
"Puritans, Colonising Activities of the English", by A. P. Newton, reviewed, 146.
"Puritans in Power", by G. B. Tatham, reviewed, 198.
PUTNAM, RUTH, (R) De Forest's "Walloon Family in America", 856.

"Quakers of Iowa", by L. T. Jones, reviewed, 210.

"Radicalism, British", by W. P. Hall, reviewed, 880.
Rambaud, Alfred, "Histoire de la Russie", reviewed, 159.
"Rastatt, Congrès de", III., by P. Montarlot and L. Pingaud, reviewed, 151.
Rava, Luigi, "Epistolario di Luigi Carlo Farini", reviewed, 156.
RAY, P. O., (R) Jones's "Life of J. Glancy Jones", 674.
READ, CONYERS, *The Fame of Sir Edward Stafford*, 292–313.
"Reconstruction in North Carolina", by J. G. de R. Hamilton, reviewed, 869.
"Reed, Thomas Brackett, Life of", by S: W. McCall, reviewed, 652.
REEVES, J. S., (R) Lord's "History of Dartmouth College", II., 436; (R) McElroy's "Winning of the Far West", 865.
"Reformation in Germany", by H: C. Vedder, reviewed, 390.
"Reform Bill, Passing of the Great", by J. R. M. Butler, reviewed, 203.
"Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe", by E: M. Hulme, reviewed, 393, 680.
"Retrospection", by H. H. Bancroft, reviewed, 211.
"Revolutionary Period in Europe", by H: E. Bourne, reviewed, 848.
"Rhode Island, Commerce of", I., reviewed, 857.
"Ribas, J. Félix, Biografía", by J. V. González, reviewed, 212.
"Rise of Modern Religious Ideas", by A. C. McGiffert, reviewed, 882.
ROBERTSON, W. S., (R) Phillips's "Confederation of Europe", 153; (R) González's "Biografía de J. Félix Ribas", 212; (R) Bolívar's "Discursos y Proclamas", 213; *United States and Spain in 1822*, 781–800.
ROBINSON, F. N., (R) Déchelette's "Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique", II., 380.
Robinson, G: E., (ed.) "Life of Saint Severinus of Eugippius", reviewed, 874.
ROBINSON, PASCHAL, (R) "Collectanea Franciscana", 193.
ROCKWELL, W: W., (R) Vedder's "Reformation in Germany", 390; (R) Guilday's "English Catholic Refugees", I., 394; (ed.) "Papers of the American Society of Church History", 2 ser., IV., reviewed, 841.
"Roger Bacon Essays", by A. G. Little, reviewed, 386.
"Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-first Year of Henry II.", reviewed, 190.
"Roman Ideas of Deity", by W. W. Fowler, reviewed, 840.
"Roman Imperialism", by Tenney Frank, reviewed, 131.
ROOT, W. T., (R) Andrews's "Materials for American History in the Public Record Office", II., 418; (R) Pennypacker's "Pennsylvania, the Keystone", 439; (R) Browning's

"Welsh Settlement of Pennsylvania", 666.
Rose, J. H., "Origins of the War", reviewed, 885.
"Roses, Wars of the", by R. B. Mowat, reviewed. 141.
Ross, E: A., (R) Johnson's Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America", 200.
"Ross, John, and the Cherokee Indians", by Rachel C. Eaton, reviewed, 672.
"Royal Historical Society, Transactions of the", 3 ser., VIII., reviewed, 655.
Ruffini, Francesco, "Camillo di Cavour e Mélanie Waldor", reviewed, 154.
"Russell, Lord John, Early Correspondence of", by Rollo Russell, reviewed, 632.
Russell, Rollo, (ed.) "Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell", reviewed, 632.
"Russian Expansion on the Pacific", by F. A. Golder, reviewed, 626, 900.
Russian Fleet and the Civil War, by F. A. Golder, 801–814; Russian difficulties, 801–802; condition of navy, 802–805; the fleet in America, 805–809; service to America, 809–812.
"Russie, Histoire de la", by Alfred Rambaud, reviewed, 159.

Sagher, E. de, (ed.) "Comptes de la Ville d'Ypres", II., reviewed, 191.
Sainsbury, Ethel B., "Calendar of the Court Minutes of the East India Company, 1650–1654", reviewed, 844.
St. Paul, Horace, "Journal of the Seven Years' War", reviewed, 627.
Salt Lake City in 1847 (doc.), 833–835.
Salzmann, L. F., "English Industries of the Middle Ages", reviewed, 136; "Henry II.", reviewed, 190.
"San Domingo, French Revolution in", by T. L. Stoddard, reviewed, 678.
"Scandinavian Element in the United States", by K. C: Babcock, reviewed, 895.
Schevill, Ferdinand, (R) "Report of the Balkan Commission", 638.
Schmidt, Nathaniel, (R) Alford's "Jewish History and Literature", 381.
"Scotch-Irish in America", by H: J. Ford, reviewed, 886.
"Scotland, Feudalism in", by H. B. King, reviewed, 427.
"Scotland, Legislative Union of England and", by P. H. Brown, reviewed, 661.
Scott, Ernest, "Captain Matthew Flinders", reviewed, 881.
Scott, W: R., (R) "English Commerce in the Tudor Period", 144.
Seebohm, Frederic, "Customary Acres", reviewed, 618.
Sellery, G: C., (R) Wylie's "Reign of Henry the Fifth", I., 143; (R) Hulme's "Renaissance", 393.
"Seven Years' War, Chapter in the History of", by G: M. Wrong, reviewed, 898.
"Seven Years' War, Journal of the", by Horace St. Paul, reviewed, 627.
"Severinus, Saint, Life of, by Eugippius", by G: W. Robinson, reviewed, 874.
"Seymour Family", by A. A. Locke, reviewed, 396.
Shambaugh, B. F., (ed.) "Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association", VII., reviewed, 893; "Applied History", II., reviewed, 896.
Shortt, Adam, (R) Boyd's "Mr. Chamberlain's Speeches", 884.
Show, A. B., (R) Douglas's "Theory of Civilisation", 654.
"Siegelkunde", by Wilhelm Ewald, reviewed, 426.
Sihler, E. G., "Cicero of Arpinum", reviewed, 383.
"Simancas, Archivo General de", by Julián Paz, reviewed, 878.
Sioussat, Annie M. L., (R) Hammond's "Colonial Mansions of Maryland and Delaware", 668.
Slave Crime in Virginia, by U. B. Phillips, 336–340.
Sloane, W: M., "The Balkans", reviewed, 410; "Party Government in the United States", reviewed, 640.
Smith, H. E., "United States Federal

Internal Tax History", reviewed, 176.
Smith, H. F. R., "Harrington and his Oceana", reviewed, 399.
Smith, J. H., (R) Paullin and Paxson's "Guide to London Archives", 171.
Smith, Munroe, (R) Hofmann's "Fürst Bismarck", 854.
Smith, T. C., "Wars between England and America", reviewed, 433.
"South Carolina, Police Control of the Slave in", by H. M. Henry, reviewed, 672.
Southern States, Cotton Factorage System of the, by A. H. Stone, 557–565.
Spain, United States and, in 1822, by W. S. Robertson, 781–800.
"Spencer, Earl, Papers of George", II., by J. S. Corbett, reviewed, 850.
"Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", by R. M. Jones, reviewed, 624.
Stafford, Sir Edward, Fame of, by Conyers Read, 292–313.
Stanhope, Ghita, "Life of Charles Third Earl of Stanhope", reviewed, 150.
"Stanhope, Life of Charles Third Earl of", reviewed, 150.
Stanwood, Edward, (R) McCall's "Life of Thomas B. Reed", 652; (R) Ogg's "Daniel Webster", 673.
Steiner, B. C., "Life of Reverdy Johnson", reviewed, 651.
Stephens, Winifred, "La Tremoïlle Family", reviewed, 396.
Stephenson, N. W., (R) Bradford's "Confederate Portraits", 177.
Stevenson, E: L., "Willem Janszoon Blaeu", reviewed, 659.
Stoddard, T. L., "French Revolution in San Domingo", reviewed, 678.
Stokes, A. P., "Memorials of Eminent Yale Men", reviewed, 677.
Stone, A. H., *The Cotton Factorage System of the Southern States,* 557–565.
Stuart, Superintendent John, Observations on the Plan of 1764 for the Management of Indian Affairs (doc.), 815–827.
"Stuarts, Virginia under the", by T: J. Wertenbaker, reviewed, 163.
"Studi Siciliani ed Italioti", I., by L. Pareti, reviewed, 378.
Sullivan, James, (R) Woolf's "Bartolus of Sassoferrato", 192.
Swift, Eben, (R) Johnston's "Bull Run", 174.

Taft, W: H., (introd.) "LeRoy's "Americans in the Philippines", reviewed, 181.
Tait, James, (ed.) "Chronica Johannis de Reading", reviewed, 194.
"Tas, Adam, Diary of", by Leo Fouché, reviewed, 662.
Tatham, G. B., "Puritans in Power", reviewed, 198.
Tawney, R. H., (ed.) "English Economic History", reviewed, 621.
"Taxation under John and Henry III.", by S. K. Mitchell, reviewed, 385.
"Tax History, United States Federal Internal", by H. E. Smith, reviewed, 176.
Taylor, H: O., "Deliverance", reviewed, 838.
Temperley, Gladys, "Henry VII.", reviewed, 428.
Temperley, Harold, "Frederick the Great and Kaiser Joseph", reviewed, 846.
Terry, S. B., "Financing of the Hundred Years' War", reviewed, 877.
"Texas, History of the Regaining of", by R. M. McElroy, reviewed, 865.
"Theory of Civilisation", by S. O. G. Douglas, reviewed, 654.
Thompson, J: W., (R) von Below's "Der Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters", 137.
Thorndike, Lynn, (R) Little's "Roger Bacon Essays", 386.
Tout, T. F., "Reign of Edward II. in English History", reviewed, 388.
Tower, Charlemagne, "Essays, Political and Historical", reviewed, 664.
"Treitschke", by Adolf Hausrath, reviewed, 883.
"Tremoïlle Family", by Winifred Stephens, reviewed, 396.
Trenholme, N. M., (R) Mowat's

"Wars of the Roses", 141; (R) Tait's "Chronica Johannis de Reading", 194; (R) Dillon and Hope's "Pageant of the Life of Richard Beauchamp", 195.
Trevelyan, Sir G: O., "George III., and Charles Fox", II., reviewed, 629.

Ulmann, Heinrich, "Geschichte der Befreiungskriege", reviewed, I., 853.
"United States, British Empire and the", by W: A. Dunning, reviewed, 648.
"United States, Materials in London Archives for the History of the", by C: O. Paullin and F: L. Paxson, reviewed, 171.
United States and Spain in 1822, by W. S. Robertson, 781–800; recognition of revolting states, 781–783; Spanish reception of this act, 783–787; Spanish instructions to other courts, 787–792; policy of French court, 792–793; of Austrian, Prussian, and Russian courts, 793–796; Castlereagh's policy, 796–799; Congress of Vienna, 799–800.
"United States Federal Internal Tax History", by H. E. Smith, reviewed, 176.
Usher, R. G., "Rise of the American People", reviewed, 161; (R) Oncken's "Historisch-Politische Aufsätze", 407; (R) Cowan's "Master-Clues in World-History", 423; (R) Hausrath's "Treitschke", 883.
"Usselinx, Willem", by Catharina Ligtenberg", reviewed 879.

Van Tyne, C. H., (R) Trevelyan's "George III., and Charles Fox", II., 629; (R) Ballagh's "Letters of Richard Henry Lee", II., 645.
Vaughn, E. V., "English Trading Expeditions under the Muscovy Company", reviewed, 144.
Vedder, H: C., "Reformation in Germany", reviewed, 390.
Vice-Presidents, Casting Votes of the, by H. B. Learned, 571.
Vinogradoff, Paul, (ed.) "Essays in Legal History", reviewed, 836.
Viollet, Paul, deceased, 685.
"Virginia, Journals of the House of Burgesses of, 1659/60–1693", by H. R. McIlwaine, reviewed, 887.
Virginia, Slave Crime in, by U. B. Phillips, 336–340.
"Virginia under the Stuarts", by T: J. Wertenbaker, reviewed, 163.

Wakeman, H. O., "History of the Church of England", reviewed, 425.
"Walloon Family in America", by Mrs. Robert W. De Forest, reviewed, 856.
"Wappenkunde", by Felix Hauptmann, reviewed, 426.
"Wars between England and America", by T. C. Smith, reviewed, 433.
"Wars of the Roses", by R. B. Mowat, reviewed, 141.
"Warwick, Earl of, Pageant of the Life of", by Viscount Dillon and W. H. St. J. Hope, reviewed, 195.
"Washington, Calendar of the Correspondence of", by J: C. Fitzpatrick, reviewed, 892.
"Washington, History of the National Capital", I., by W. B. Bryan, reviewed, 421.
"Washington Letters", reviewed, 207.
"Webster, Daniel", by F: A. Ogg, reviewed, 673.
Wellington, R. G., "Political and Sectional Influence of the Public Lands", reviewed, 434.
Wells, C: L., (R) Wakeman's "Introduction to the History of the Church of England", 425; (R) McGlothlin's "Guide to the Study of Church History", 650.
"Welsh Settlement of Pennsylvania", by C: H. Browning, reviewed, 666.
Wertenbaker, T: J., "Virginia under the Stuarts", reviewed, 163.
"Wessex, Early Wars of", by A. F. Major, reviewed, 188.
Westermann, W: L., (R) Frank's "Roman Imperialism", 131; *The Economic Basis of the Decline of Ancient Culture*, 723–743.
"West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution, The", by P. C. Phillips, reviewed, 671.

"West Virginia, Semi-Centennial History of", by J. M. Callahan, reviewed, 441.
"Whig Party in the South", by A. C. Cole, reviewed, 649.
Whistler, C: W., (ed.) "Early Wars of Wessex", reviewed, 188.
WILLARD, J. F., (R) Mitchell's "Taxation under John and Henry III.", 385; (R) Terry's "Financing of the Hundred Years' War", 877.
Williamson, J. A., "Maritime Enterprise", reviewed, 658.
"Winning of the Far West", by R. M. McElroy, reviewed, 865.
Witchcraft, James I., and, by G: L. Kittredge, 570.
"Witchcraft Cases, Narratives of the", by G: L. Burr, reviewed, 164.
WOODBINE, G: E., (R) Beale's "Bartolus on the Conflict of Laws", 876.
WOODBURN, J. A., (R) Sloane's "Party Government in the United States", 640; (R) Steiner's "Life of Reverdy Johnson", 651.
Woolf, C. N. S., "Bartolus of Sassoferrato", reviewed, 192.
WOOLSEY, T. S., (R) Tower's "Essays, Political and Historical", 664.
Wrong, G: M., "The Fall of Canada", reviewed, 898.
Wylie, J: H., "Reign of Henry the Fifth", I., reviewed, 143.

"Yale Men, Memorials of Eminent", by A. P. Stokes, reviewed, 677.
"Ypres, Comptes de la Ville d'", II., by G. des Marez, and E. de Sagher, reviewed, 191.